DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 115 SO 007 361

AUTHOR	Millett, John
TITLE	Explorations in Undergraduate Education: Why Political Science. Report of a Study.
INSTITUTION	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	Bull-35
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	69p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; Colleges; Community Colleges; Curriculum Design; Departmental Teaching Plans; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Educational Research; Educational Resources; *Educational Status Comparison; Educational Strategies; Faculty; *Higher Education; Institutional Role; *Political Science; Student Role; Teaching Procedures; *Undergraduate Study; Universities

ABSTRACT

To learn how a discipline in higher education perceives its instructional role in undergraduate study, six case studies of the process of undergraduate education in political science were prepared and analyzed. An advisory panel was formed to develop the study procedure, to select the institutions studied, and to choose the authors. The case studies drew from an outline of 50 questions. Data was obtained from a variety of institutions by authors who were representative of the discipline. The analysis of the case studies is divided into six sections: the knowledge of political science; the objectives of undergraduate education in political science; students, faculty and institutions; the curriculum for undergraduate education in political science; instructional practices and resources; and a conclusion. (Author/KSM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Why Political Science?

SØ 007361

ED 090115

Explorations in Undergraduate Education:

Why Political Science?

Report of a Study

By **John Millett**
Academy for Educational Development

Bulletin No. 35, 1973

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1905 primarily to provide retiring allowances for college teachers and pensions for their widows. It also conducts studies of various educational problems.

Contents

Foreword	7
Introductory Note	11
I. The Knowledge of Political Science	13
II. The Objectives of Undergraduate Education in Political Science	23
III. Students, Faculty, and Institution	36
IV. The Curriculum for Undergraduate Education in Political Science	46
V. Instructional Practices and Resources	54
VI. By Way of Conclusion	62

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

Foreword

Much of the research and writing about higher education tends to be concerned with broadly defined characteristics of students, of faculty, and of the institutions—colleges and universities—where the two groups interact in a learning process. Students are often analyzed in terms of intellectual abilities, family background, interests, attitudes, expectations, and achievements; faculty members in terms of educational preparation, special competencies, scholarly output, teaching effectiveness, compensation, and attitudes; and institutions in terms of stated purposes, scope of programs, enrollment size, location, instructional practices, quality of programs, finances, and governing arrangements.

Then, too, many of the studies of individual colleges and universities tend to view the enterprise as a unit—as a whole with some kind of definable identity. For this reason the perspective is often that of the president and his or her associates who are expected to see the enterprise as a coherent set of objectives, to articulate these purposes, to advance their accomplishment, and to preserve and enhance the well-being of the institution.

There is nothing wrong with this perspective. But to those familiar with individual colleges and universities there is always the nagging doubt as to whether or not it presents a portrayal of reality.

All of these endeavors, although they have added substantially to our awareness of the accomplishments, the failures, and the difficulties of American higher education, have seldom seemed to keep pace with our needs, and they continue with the sheer momentum of tradition and current social expectation, guided only in part by the intelligent choices of decision-makers.

During the winter of 1972-73, the trustees of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching gave new attention to the identification of major problems of higher education in this country: how to learn more about these problems, and how to encourage possible improvements in the operation of higher education. It was their view that some new kind of understanding about the nature of colleges and universities might be obtained through a study of the academic disciplines. How does a discipline perceive its instructional role? How does

a discipline perceive its instructional environment? The answers to these questions might, they felt, provide further insight into how colleges and universities do in fact proceed to carry out their missions.

The trustees decided for the present to restrict any effort at analysis to undergraduate instruction and to exclude graduate education and graduate professional education. The bulk of student enrollment in the United States is found at the undergraduate level, and it is undergraduate education which has been of major concern to many colleges and universities since the 1960's. Moreover the instructional issues presented by undergraduate education are quite different from those at the graduate and graduate professional level.

In focusing on the academic disciplines within undergraduate education, it seemed appropriate also to exclude from concern the undergraduate professional fields of study such as agriculture, business, engineering, music, and teacher education. The distinction between undergraduate education in a discipline and undergraduate education in a professional field of study may not be exact. To some extent almost all undergraduate students in professional fields are usually expected to obtain some instruction in the disciplines. Generally, the disciplines are supposed to provide the intellectual base for professional study and to provide for all undergraduate students those qualities of knowledge and concern which separate the college-educated from other persons.

The choice of political science as the starting point was more or less fortuitous; studies in other disciplines will be expected to follow in due course. It should be noted that the American Political Science Association has received a sizeable grant from the National Science Foundation to examine in detail the undergraduate curriculum in political science and to develop proposals for its improvement. The Carnegie Foundation interest and the APSA interest should thus be seen as complementary and not competing.

For guidance on a method of examining undergraduate education in political science, and then for preparation of an exploratory report, the Carnegie Foundation turned to John D. Millett, an officer of the Academy for Educational Development. Formerly a professor of Public Administration at Columbia University, later President of Miami University, and more recently Chancellor for public higher education in Ohio, Dr. Millett has had a continuing interest in political science as a discipline, in undergraduate education as a part of higher education, and in the operations of colleges and universities.

The procedure of the study involved several stages. An advisory panel was formed to assist the project director in developing the study procedure and selecting the institutions and authors of case studies, and by participating in the study discussion conference and reviewing the study report. This panel was chaired by James A. Perkins, a Foundation trustee, and included Professor Marvin Bressler of Princeton University; Rhoda M. Dorsey, Vice President for Academic Affairs of Goucher College; Evron M. Kirkpatrick, Executive Director of the American Political Science Association; and Richard H. Sullivan of the Foundation staff. The basic method of inquiry itself involved the preparation of six case studies of the process of undergraduate education in political science as organized and performed by the departments of political science in the selected institutions. This task was undertaken by members of the departments who drew on Dr. Millett's outline of some 50 questions to which the authors were invited to respond.

The case-study authors were asked to be as detailed and as frank as possible in the preparation of their reports. Although the contents are confidential in nature, they have provided the primary basis for the information and impressions set forth herein by the project director.

In selecting the authors for these six case studies, two considerations were dominant. One was to obtain data from a variety of institutions; the other was to find authors who were representative of the discipline and could meet the limited time schedule of the entire project. On both counts the Foundation considers itself to have been most fortunate.

The six colleges and universities and the six authors involved in these case studies were as follows:

A Research University	
Stanford University (Private)	Heinz Eulau
A Comprehensive University	
Northern Illinois University (Public)	Martin Diamond
General Colleges	
Central State University (Ohio)	David W. Hazel
Jacksonville University (Private)	Joan S. Carver
A Selective Liberal Arts College	
Mt. Holyoke College (Private)	Victoria Schuck
A Two-Year College	
The Loop College, City Colleges of Chicago	Gloria L. Carrig

These case studies were considered during a two-day discussion conference held in June 1973, bringing together some 25 persons of whom about half were political scientists, with the rest educated and experienced in other disciplines. Their comments and observations have provided an additional valuable contribution to the contents of this report.

I would like to express the appreciation of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to the Academy for Educational Development and to John Millett for conducting this study on the Foundation's behalf.

Alan Pifer

President

Introductory Note

This has not been a study of political science as a discipline, as a body of knowledge, or as a method for advancing knowledge about man in political society. Rather, this has been an exploration in undergraduate education viewed from the perspective of one particular discipline—the discipline of political science. There are limitations obviously to this procedure. Perhaps the problems of political science as a discipline unduly influence or affect the problems of undergraduate education and the problems of governance and management in a particular institution of higher education.

And of course it will be said that experiences drawn from six case studies prepared in six very different institutions of higher education provide an inadequate data base from which to formulate generalizations about the state of the discipline, the state of departments of political science, and the state of undergraduate education in this country. The data of this study have been impressionistic rather than quantitative. Nonetheless, the author is inclined to think that the generalizations set forth herein will correspond closely with generalizations which might be drawn from other research procedures.

John D. Millett
November, 1973

I/The Knowledge of Political Science

The teaching of political science is the purposeful endeavor of a particular faculty member certified to be a political scientist to communicate to students an understanding of things political. This communication occurs primarily through thought expressed in language. Communication may of course involve sense impressions and observations, both visual and audial. Communication involves of course both a communicator and a communicant. But the symbols of language are the vessels of thought, and scholarly communication is essentially the art of communicating thought.

The complications in any effort to achieve understanding are many. For political science the complications begin with a circumstance simple to state, immensely difficult to explain. Political science as a discipline is an elusive body of knowledge. As scholars, political scientists believe that in things political there is a distinctive and identifiable area of culture, institutional structure, and social behavior which challenge man's understanding. There is one and only one overriding objective in the study of political science, including undergraduate education in political science. That objective is the discovery of truth about things political.

The problem in political science is that having stated an objective, there is no generally acceptable procedure known to human intelligence for achieving the desired goal. Among political scientists there are sharp arguments about what they know and how they know it. As a discipline, political science had a dual origin: in political history and in political philosophy. Political history provided a record of man's experience in political society, primarily the experience of Western culture and of America since 1607. This political history was mostly a chronology of events and of political figures; only on occasion did the political historian profess to find recurring themes and regularities in this experience which might suggest probabilities of future events. Political philosophy identified the "big issues" or the "perennial questions" about political order which had challenged the speculative interest of man, especially in Western culture. Political philosophy offered the wisdom of individual observation and commentary from the time of Plato to the present day. Yet this accumulated wisdom provided little in the way of "objective" stan-

dards for the operation of political institutions or for the guidance of man's political choices.

The early study of political science in the United States was largely descriptive of the political institutions in the United States, along with those of other nations. This description was augmented by a case-by-case examination of public law and by an historical appraisal of relations among nations. After World War II, political scientists in the United States were widely disenchanted with the state of knowledge in their discipline. In particular, considerable efforts were made to discover probabilities in political behavior, especially in the voting behavior, of persons in the aggregate. Increased attention was also given to political attitudes in relation to socio-economic status, age, geography, ethnic background, and race. Some concern was also given to the socialization process, the process of society whereby the individual child and young adult was prepared to assume his or her role in the political community. In large part, the technique of survey research and of statistical analysis was applied to this study. For lack of a better label, this endeavor came to be known as the behavioral approach to knowledge about things political.[1]

The behavioral school of political scientists has generally sought two interrelated ends. One purpose has been to advance an empirical knowledge of politics, a science of politics, an understanding of recurring patterns and of probabilities in the realm of politics. This purpose has been sought by a collection of factual data from which scholars, through inductive logic, infer certain generalizations or concepts about political behavior in society.[2] The second purpose has been to develop a body of knowledge which was relatively separate from value-judgments about good and evil, justice and injustice, in political behavior. This purpose

---

[1] There is a voluminous literature about political science as a discipline. Only a sampling can be cited here:

Anna Heddow, *Political Science in American Colleges, 1636-1900* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1939);

Roland Young, ed., *Approaches to the Study of Politics* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1958);

Charles S. Hyneman, *The Study of Politics* (Urban: University of Illinois Press, 1959);

Vernon Van Dyke, *Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960);

Bernard Crick, *The American Science of Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964); and

Albert Samit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *The Development of American Political Science from Burgess to Behavioralism* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967).

[2] This endeavor and the resulting propositions are well illustrated in Robert Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

has been sought by making a distinction between facts about things political and moral or ethical judgments about things political. Behavioralists have been criticized as ignoring or underrating the ethics of political behavior. The response has been that behavioralists were not inclined to belittle the importance of moral purpose or of moral evaluation in political behavior; they simply sought to develop a distinctive kind of knowledge and a distinctive approach to knowledge.[3]

One of the limitations encountered in the effort to develop an empirical knowledge of things political has been the paucity of research techniques available to and used by the political science scholar. In the effort to achieve a science of social behavior, four major procedures have been identified.[4] These have been labelled: (1) experimentation, (2) the statistical survey, (3) the participant-observer and clinical study, and (4) the formal method or model. The experimental method, widely used in psychology, has not been available to the political scientist; one cannot ordinarily experiment with human political institutions and political behavior at the will of the scholar. The clinical study of political behavior utilizing concepts of Freud has been attempted in this country but has not proven particularly fruitful and has not been generally pursued.[5] The participant-observer procedure, widely employed in anthropology, has had its counterpart in various case studies by political scientists. The difficulty has been that case studies in political behavior often involve discrete events and places which may or may not warrant generalization. Formal methods, such as game theory and systems analysis, have offered some helpful insights about political behavior but have not provided the clear-cut generalization-prediction understanding that was hoped for. The survey of attitudes and the statistical analysis of voting have provided some understanding of certain predispositions in political behavior among electors, legislators, and others. Here again one encounters the problem of persistence in such behavior: Is past experience a reliable indicator of future action?

There are various approaches to knowledge which may be labelled "scientific" or "behavioral." One such approach is to view the political process as essentially a social structure for the allocation of benefits

[3] Cf. Heinz Eulau and James G. March, eds., *Political Science* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

[4] Cf. Paul Diesing, *Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971).

[5] Cf. Harold D. Lasswell, *Psychopathology and Politics* (New York: The Viking Press, 1960), a revision and reissue of a work first published in 1930.

from political action. In this structure some persons and some groups have more influence than others. In this process persons and groups generally pursue conflicting goals; in some fashion these conflicts must be adjusted or compromised if a particular political society is to endure. It has been suggested that in this allocation of benefits, conflicts in political society may be reduced and order may be preserved if there are increases in the total benefits to be distributed and if there is a widespread sharing of these benefits.

Another approach is to view political society as a system, as a bundle of relationships among people originating in pre-history and continuing down to the present day in various forms and transformations. In this system there are inputs, a process, and outputs.[6] The outputs are political decisions and political actions necessary to implement those decisions. The inputs may be beliefs drawn from political tradition, current ideas about political needs, external threats, existing political anxieties, and the state of political leadership. The process whereby inputs are converted into outputs involves a structure of power and a structure of political institutions. The stability of the process may depend in large part upon the acceptability of the output.

To be sure, the whole endeavor to construct a science of politics has been strongly criticized on several grounds. One such ground is the argument that a science of knowledge appropriate to certain physical and biological processes of our environment and of our life on planet earth are not necessarily transferable to the social processes of political behavior. Another argument is that the generalization-prediction model of scientific thought since the time of Newton is a purely intellectual construct which is beginning to reveal its own inadequacies and inconsistencies as empirical investigation proceeds. The current inadequacies of the model, it is said, are not yet understood by political science scholars. Another argument is that political behavior must be understood in the context of time and of evolutionary processes, and that change rather than regularities and probabilities characterize these processes.[7]

On the other hand, political scientists who are primarily concerned with the normative aspects of political behavior have their problems as well. It is not too difficult to identify the major issues of political concern which have characterized the thought of the principal political

---

[6]Cf. David Easton, *The Political System* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953); *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965); and *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965).

[7]Cf. Thomas Landon Thorsen, *Biopolitics* (New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1970).

philosophers in the Western tradition since the writings of Plato. These issues may be stated in various ways but their essentials are not in dispute. These issues involve the role of individual man in political society, the equality or inequality of those comprising political society, the existence of political power in society as a condition of order, the limitations upon political power, the ends of political power, and the meaning of political experience.[8] A number of questions have been troublesome over centuries of time: Why does man obey, how does man escape from tyrannical power, is it justified for the state to commit evil acts for good ends, how can political power be restrained from tyrannical acts, how can the ends of government be directed exclusively to the general welfare, should political power be widely shared in a society, what constitutes individual freedom in a political society, what constitutes equality in political society, how should the benefits of political action be distributed, how does tradition and experience influence current political behavior? These and similar questions can be multiplied almost endlessly. But how does a person proceed to answer these questions? And what part does a knowledge of these issues have in affecting the answers which any political society has to give to these questions in terms of its actual operation at any given time?

The political scientist who wrestles with these questions is convinced of their immense intellectual importance. He or she is well aware that they can be answered only by means of moral standards which become the operational ideals of a political society, ideals which are given operational validity and not just lip service. The political scientist who seeks such answers and the moral standards which guide the answers depends in large part upon an intellectual discourse accumulated over a span of nearly 2,500 years of Western culture. But the answers and the standards are never final, are at best often a fragile construct of great minds, and may influence political behavior only in part.

There is yet another approach to examining things political in society. This is to identify and analyze the current critical political concerns of man in society. It is not too difficult to list these critical concerns, such as international peace, economic well-being, the elimination or amelioration of poverty, ecological survival, urban amenities, law and order, justice and community in social relationships. Any and all of these problems appear to be of considerable interest to students today. In some instances students seem to be seeking simple and instant

[8]Cf. Glenn Tinder, *Political Thinking: The Perennial Questions* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970).

answers to problems which entail age-old complexities. The political analysis of these current concerns is an appropriate task for the political scientist. But the discussion of the possible lines of political action to meet these problems calls for the utilization of knowledge drawn from disciplines other than political science. The consideration of problems of public policy is an inter-disciplinary undertaking in the social sciences, and may involve the biological and physical sciences, history, philosophy, and literature as well.

There is a growing interest among political scientists in the evaluation of political societies. By what criteria do we judge the performance of a particular political process? By what criteria do we judge the outputs of a particular political process? Furthermore, who does the evaluating? There are other issues as well. How do we "know" that liberal democracy is the most satisfactory form of government yet practiced by man? How do we "discover" or bring about a better form of government? What is the impact of social structure upon political structure? What kinds of alternatives in political action are possible within the framework of a given set of political institutions? These are difficult questions to consider, equally difficult for the behavioralist, the philosopher, the policy analyst.

To the extent that there is agreement among political scientists about any intellectual effort to discuss the evaluation of political processes and of political outcomes, it is that the whole subject must be handled with caution. The procedure of evaluation is approached in terms of judgments about facts, judgments about values, and judgments about available choices. And all these judgments must be made in the context of a limited knowledge, and in the context of a political society of limited rationality.

The problem then for the political scientist engaged in the education of undergraduates in the knowledge of things political is how to organize and present an understanding of that knowledge. The problem is first a problem in philosophy, in epistemology, in how to define knowledge. The problem is secondly a problem in communication of knowledge. When there are substantial differences within the discipline about the nature of the knowledge to be communicated, how does a department of political science proceed?

The approach to this problem by the six departments of political science participating in this study contained several common elements. The problem was clearly and fully perceived. The response to the problem was primarily one of trying to move around it, or of learning how to

live with it. The response was primarily one of coping with the realities of philosophical differences.

In the first place, all of the case studies pointed out that the role of the political scientist as a scholar and educator entailed certain limitations. The political scientist practicing in an academic environment was not a propagandist, an apologist, or an ideologist for any particular political tradition, political power structure, set of political institutions, public policy, or political behavior. The political scientist as academic political scientist was engaged in an effort to assist students to discover a knowledge about things political. This effort by the political scientist did not mean that he or she had no personal attachment to certain standards of desirable political conduct. It did not imply any absence of individual value preferences and of individual ethical principles. Rather, it meant that the political scientist as scholar and educator made a clear differentiation between his or her definition of knowledge and his or her personal attitudes and beliefs.

In the second place, political scientists in various ways undertook to assist undergraduate students toward two kinds of understanding about things political. The political scientist is convinced that the political affairs and political behavior of man in society constitute a vital range of issues for man's physical, material, and spiritual well-being. In addition, the political scientist is equally convinced that man's knowledge of political motivation and political conduct is at best fragmentary, sketchy, uncertain, and changing. This knowledge, moreover, is two-dimensional: what is and what should be. There are few if any eternal verities, fixed orbits, strong inferences, or high probabilities in man's knowledge about the political characteristics of his own life.

In the third place, political scientists understood and appreciated the fact that there were various approaches to a knowledge of political reality and a knowledge of political ideals. These approaches might be historical, behavioral, philosophical, or analytical. Departments of political science thought it desirable to present all these approaches to students. Political scientists gathered together in a department sought to have included in their number persons representative of various modes of political thinking.

It is apparent from this study that departments of political science are well aware of their varied choices in the definition of knowledge about things political, in the perspectives of political knowledge, and in the approaches to political evaluation. The strategy of the political science department confronted with these choices is to avoid choice.

Even where the department is quite small in the number of faculty positions, the disposition still is to seek variety not orthodoxy in communicating with students about an understanding of things political.

Political science departments have not seen their role in the academic enterprise, or in the undergraduate education of students, as that of arriving at an agreed-upon definition of knowledge, even an elective definition. There is little evidence that political scientists as political scientists are familiar with or have given much attention to the comprehensive and multiple definition of knowledge formulated by the educational philosopher, Philip H. Phenix.[9] Rather the departmental point of view is that each political scientist must formulate for himself or herself and must share with students his or her own philosophy of knowledge, explicitly or implicitly stated whereby the political community of man is conceptualized, explored, and criticized.

Departments also tend to avoid a choice about how to introduce the student to the knowledge of political science. One possibility is to begin by discussing political science as a discipline, as a body of limited knowledge concerned with very big problems. Another possibility is to look at these big problems such as who governs and why and so to attract the student's attention at once to the common concerns in all structures of government. A third possibility is to ask the student to explore his or her understanding of the actual functioning of American government and thus in this context to begin to comprehend the major concerns of man in political society.[10]

The response of departments of political science to this question about how to introduce the subject of political science to undergraduate students is to leave the decision to the faculty member organizing and presenting the course. In one large political science department, the department as a group did debate the question about the desirability of one single approach to the introduction of political science. The decision was to offer all the available methods of introduction and to let the student make his own choice among them.

---

[9]Philip H. Phenix, *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[10]These possibilities may be illustrated by the following so-called introductory texts: Stephen L. Wasby, *Political Science: The Discipline and Its Dimensions*, an Introduction (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970); Austin Ranney, *The Governing of Men*, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971); and James MacGregor Burns and Jack Walter Peltason, *Government by the People*, 8th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972).

It seems clear from this study that within the larger departments of political science the conflict between behavioralists and humanists, between empiricists and philosophers, has been resolved by a policy of mutual accommodation and of tolerance. Each department seeks both kinds of faculty competence. This is the policy even in the smaller departments. To some extent the joining of diverse endeavors has had its positive pay-off. The empiricist and the philosopher have learned to share a common effort. The empiricist formulates theory and recognizes its normative implications. The political philosopher resorts to empirical data to bolster his exposition of moral standards in political thought. In the large departments it appears that political scientists of various persuasions tend to live in a considerable degree of harmony and mutual respect.

Moreover, the political philosopher seems to be less concerned than perhaps was the case in earlier years to protect his domain from the criticism that he is concerned with the "soft" ethics of politics while his behavioral colleague is concerned with the "hard" science of politics. The mathematics of regression analysis and of multivariate analysis do not now appear as more rigorous in intellectual endeavor than the logic of ethics of the hierarchy of value preferences. The behavioralist and the political philosopher both expect scholarship rather than emotion to guide their search for knowledge about politics.

Today there is a growing recognition that political behavior is in part an expression of beliefs based upon attitudes and experience and in part an expression of purpose, an effort to achieve desired goals. The ethical nature of the means and the ends of the political process is generally accepted as an integral part of political knowledge and of political concern. The political scientist as scholar is not devoid of ethical knowledge when he seeks to avoid personal bias in his discussion of political behavior; rather such caution is an indispensable means to a careful handling of personal preferences and of personal differences.

Political theory in turn appears to be in the process of rejuvenation and rehabilitation. Some political scientists attribute the decline of political theory as an indispensable part of political science in the past one hundred years as a consequence of two major trends: the rise of logical positivism and the appearance of a multiplicity of political ideologies. Caught between these two intellectual forces, the political philosopher tended to lose his or her role as a guide to the wisdom of hard choices in political behavior. The teaching of political philosophy was apt to be founded upon a positivistic history or a commitment to an ideology.

There is evidence, so it was asserted during this study, that this situation has now changed, or is changing. The political philosopher is once again coming to the fore. There is a moral issue wherever there is a political problem, a dilemma, or a conflict to be resolved by a choice among alternatives. The political philosopher seeks to provide his or her particular insight gained from logic and from an accumulated body of theoretical formulations as another contribution to the forum where truth and morality are the arbiters of behavior, not the barricades and the concentration camp. Philosophers and behavioralists are equally committed to the market place of ideas as the road to the resolution of conflict. And this market place of ideas begins in a political science department, whence one hopes it may permeate the whole body politic.

One final observation may be noted. It is sometimes said that the biological and physical scientist is likely to achieve his or her major contribution to the knowledge of his or her subject matter before reaching 40 or 45 years of age. But several of the case studies pointed out that the political scientist is likely to offer his or her major contribution to the knowledge of politics at a later age. Accumulated experience with the discipline and with political society enables the political scientist as the years advance to deal more objectively and dispassionately with that inevitable tension in society between what is and what might be, between how man is governed and how he ought to be governed. The undergraduate student, we are told, tends to be impatient; the undergraduate student is likely to argue that if it is necessary to use authority to make man perfect, then let's use the necessary authority. The scholar of political science in his or her wisdom has learned to fear authority and to ask what the assurances are that man can exercise authority to make other men perfect and not be corrupted in the very process of exercising that authority.

II/The Objectives of Undergraduate Education in Political Science

Undergraduate education in political science occurs within the framework of a college of arts and sciences or the framework of a college transfer unit within a community college. This undergraduate education further occurs within the context of a general education program or of a liberal education program. The question then arises to what extent do the objectives of general education and of liberal education affect undergraduate education in political science. The formulation of these objectives would arise within the community college or the college of arts and sciences. The impact of this formulation would then be observable at the level of the department of political science.

These terms, general education and liberal education, require some comment. The designation "general education" as a component part of undergraduate education gained widespread recognition in the United States with the publication of the Harvard University report in 1945, often referred to as the "red book."[1] Actually, the American Council on Education had sponsored a cooperative study of general education which had begun in 1939 and continued through 1944. And there were elements of the general education idea which went back at least to the end of World War I.[2] For the most part, it is fair to say, however, that general education as a concept in American higher education is most closely associated with the Harvard report.

Essentially, the idea of general education is that a certain body of knowledge should be explored by all students enrolled in higher education regardless of their specialized interests. After the Civil War in the United States, the classical curriculum which generally comprised undergraduate education prior to 1860 began to disintegrate. Its place was taken first by the curriculum in the arts and sciences which was greatly expanded to embrace more and more specialized bodies of knowledge, or disciplines. In addition, more and more professional

[1] *General Education in A Free Society.* Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945).

[2] *A College Program in Action.* A Review of Working Principles at Columbia College by the Committee on Plans (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

fields of study began to appear at the undergraduate level of higher education and their own specialized curricula: agriculture, architecture, art, business administration, engineering, forestry, journalism, mining and metallurgy, music, nursing, social work, and teacher education. Thus undergraduate education in America became education in the arts and sciences and in various professions.

To some extent undergraduate education in the arts and sciences continued to be known as liberal education, with certain assumed purposes which still held to the idea or ideal of a renaissance man.[3] Liberal education was generally thought of as a four-year baccalaureate program provided by a college of arts and sciences. A good part of the program might involve specialization or a major in a particular discipline and the whole might be thought of as pre-professional education for graduate study, law, medicine, and theology. Presumably, so the argument went, there was still an identifiable educational endeavor known as liberal learning and this liberal learning was the special province of a college of arts and sciences.

General education as a concept became something different from liberal education. General education was the core of learning appropriate for all undergraduates, regardless of their special or major interest in the arts and sciences and regardless of their field of professional education as an undergraduate. General education was a part of liberal education, but only a part, and general education was common education for all higher education students. In the words of the Harvard report, general education was intended to "fit young people so far as it can for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they will share with others"; general education meant "that part of a student's whole education which looks first of all to his life as a responsible human being and citizen." The Harvard report of 1945 went on to propose that general education should involve three broad areas of study: man's physical environment, man's corporate life, and man's inner vision and standards. Such study, it was suggested, should take up at least half of a student's time spread over four years of undergraduate education.[4]

---

[3]The first of recent defenses of liberal learning was set forth in John Cardinal Newman, *The Idea of A University* (1852). Other statements may be found in Alexander Meiklejohn, *The Liberal College* (Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1920); Howard Mumford Jones, *One Great Society* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1959); *Reflections on the Role of Liberal Education*, Association of American Colleges, being the May 1964 edition of Liberal Education.

[4]Cf. Russell Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962).

With the development in higher education of the idea of general education, the problem of the college of arts and sciences was to define and pursue an objective of liberal education. Liberal education somehow was to incorporate general education and the advance to still other goals.[5] But precisely what these other goals should be was seldom articulated in any specific fashion. Every college of arts and sciences was left to formulate these goals in its own way, and the common pattern insofar as any could be observed was one of specialization of subject matter interest built upon a general education base.[6]

Undergraduate education in political science is presumably a part of one of these larger purposes: general education or liberal education. The students who enroll do so within the institutional framework of a community college or of a college of arts and sciences. Such students may have quite varied interests. Within a community college the undergraduate student may be enrolled in the college transfer curriculum or he or she may be pursuing some technical education program and elect a course in political science in order to satisfy such general education requirements as the technical curriculum may prescribe. Within a college of arts and sciences the undergraduate student may enroll in a political science course to satisfy general education requirements, or to fulfill certain "free elective" requirements, or to pursue a specialized interest in the social sciences, including political science. Many varied interests can be and are encountered in the student enrollments of political science.

From these case studies of undergraduate education in political science it is evident, however, that political scientists in their instructional role are little disposed to speculate about or to define the objectives of a general education or of a liberal education. Faculty members in political science departments accept the fact that they are part of some larger whole known as a general education program or as a liberal education program. They accept the fact, but they are not disposed to give that fact any particular operational meaning. The interest of political scientists is to pursue their own scholarly role in their own individual fashion.

Insofar as the colleges and universities participating in this study were concerned, the concepts of a general education and of a liberal education were expressed in one way and one way only. This expression

---

[5]Cf. Maxwell H. Goldberg, *Design in Liberal Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971).

[6]The best review of both general education and liberal education goals, with a curriculum for their realization, will be found in Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

found its objective reality in a set of distribution and concentration for award of the associate degree or of the baccalaureate. The student was then left to make his or her own choices, and the department of political science was left to offer such courses as the department considered desirable. The prevailing practice within the community college and the college of arts and sciences was to divide the various disciplines into four or five groupings: the biological sciences, the physical sciences, the social and behavioral sciences, and mathematics. In one instance modern foreign languages constituted a separate group, and in another instance history and philosophy were set apart as a distinct group of studies. The scholars in the learned disciplines are by no means agreed on how to classify the common characteristics of the disciplines which comprise the liberal arts and sciences.

Distribution and concentration requirements for award of a degree vary from college to college. The tendency in distribution requirements in a community college is to expect the student to enroll in either three or four courses from among those provided by the division offering the general education program. Within the baccalaureate college the student may be required to enroll in one year-long course in both the biological and physical sciences and two courses in other divisions. The distribution requirements may be as many as 45 units out of 120 course units for the baccalaureate. The concentration requirements may be quite similar in the college of arts and sciences; the student may be expected to have enrolled in and obtained 45 units of credit in a specialized "major."

But beyond these distribution and concentration requirements, it is evident that the disciplines in concert one with another are not inclined to establish any particular set of objectives for general education or for liberal education. Similarly, within the group of disciplines known as the social and behavioral sciences there is no inclination to develop instructional objectives in common. Survey courses and interdisciplinary courses are not in favor. The one exception was found in the case of the public community college where a number of the faculty members had had their graduate education at the University of Chicago. In this instance a survey course labelled Social Science I was offered by the division of the social sciences. The second semester of this year-long course was taught by faculty members from the disciplines of history, economics, and political science. Each faculty member taught one or more sections throughout the semester but taught from a syllabus prepared on an interdisciplinary basis.

The social and behavioral sciences recognize some affinity among these disciplines and acknowledge that there are interrelationships in their subject matter interests. This recognition in operation takes the form, however, of an acceptance of certain course units from various disciplines toward a concentration in a particular discipline. The recognition of common interests does not express itself in a cooperative endeavor to establish educational objectives or to develop jointly the means for accomplishing such objectives.

When we turn to the department of political science itself, we find once again a reluctance on the part of the department as a department to undertake to define any specific objectives for undergraduate education. Faculty members as a group are aware of a dual pull: one is to define and provide a body of knowledge in political science so that the undergraduate student, whatever his or her interest and however slight his or her exposure, will acquire an awareness of the scope of political science as a discipline; the other pull is the desire of each individual faculty member to teach courses of special interest to the faculty member. Within a large department of political science the possibility of trying to define a body of accepted knowledge in political science is recognized as unrealistic. Educational objectives are determined by each faculty member individually. The department professes only the objective of offering evidence of scholarship in the educational endeavors of each faculty member.

In a small department of political science of three or even six persons, the faculty members must necessarily seek to define educational objectives with some degree of clarity. Because their personnel resources are small, these departments must set forth in some kind of coherence a plan for providing a desirable scope of political knowledge for undergraduate students. Yet even in these instances faculty members strive to offer as much variety in knowledge and perspective as possible.

Within the discipline of political science there are several generally recognized areas of sub-specialization. The usually accepted areas are American politics, comparative politics, international politics, public law, political theory, and public administration. Within these broad categories there may be still further subdivisions; for example, within the field of comparative politics there may be faculty members specializing in Russian government, Western European governments, African governments, Far Eastern governments, and Latin American governments. Within the field of political theory there may be specializations in classical thought, medieval thought, renaissance and reformation thought, and

contemporary thought. Moreover, within any of these specialized fields of interest there may be various methodological approaches or perspectives: behavioral, institutional-functional, legal, historical, and policy analysis.

Of the five departments studied here offering undergraduate education for the baccalaureate, four required their majors to enroll in courses divided among sub-specializations. In this way an effort was made to acquaint undergraduate students with the breadth of knowledge about things political. In one department there were four areas of sub-specialization and the major student was required to obtain course units in three of these; in another department there were six areas of sub-specialization and the major student was required to enroll in four of these. This kind of distribution pattern within the discipline of political science itself appears to be a common departmental practice.

For a number of years one department of political science had prepared and accepted a general statement of objectives. This statement read:

> The purpose of instruction in the Department of Political Science is: (1) to offer all students courses designed to introduce them to the political aspects of society, to educate them in the analysis of political problems, and to equip them for the exercise of their duties as citizens; (2) to provide undergraduate majors with a program of study leading to the A.B. degree in political science as a foundation for a liberal education; (3) to prepare students for post-graduate executive management programs in government and industry; (4) to give candidates for graduate degrees education preparatory to careers in government, research, teaching, or private enterprise where a knowledge of domestic politics and foreign affairs is in demand; and (5) to prepare students for a career in the foreign service.

This statement of purpose was quietly dropped in 1969 because faculty members found it unacceptable and because they recognized that it made commitments which they were not prepared to fulfill. No thought was given to writing a more acceptable statement simply because the faculty members were convinced that they could not agree upon anything except the most general kind of definition of purpose, a definition so general as to be without meaning. Each faculty member was encouraged instead to set forth definitions of objectives on a course by course basis, and to do this in some detail and with some specific

indication of the behavioral outcomes expected to be achieved. Various faculty members treated this encouragement with varying degrees of serious compliance. The behavioral outcomes specified usually involved the accomplishment of a certain body of knowledge, the acquisition of a certain degree of skill in handling ideas and materials, and some motivation for participation in the political process.

In another instance a department did find itself in some agreement as a whole about the objectives of undergraduate education in political science. These objectives were set forth as (1) to provide the basis for an intelligent understanding of the problems of government and of international relations; (2) to furnish an adequate preparation for graduate study in one of the social sciences or for graduate professional study such as law; and (3) to offer the foundation for a career in public affairs. The faculty members found such a formulation generally acceptable subject to their own interpretation in the context of their own course offerings.

Departments of political science have not been inclined to undertake any general effort to obtain from students their sense of personal objective in enrolling for courses. Students express their purposes by voting, that is, by their selection of the particular courses they are moved to enroll in. Faculty members recognize that student interest as expressed by enrollment is important, and adjustments in objectives and in practice do result from changing enrollment preferences.

It is reported that students currently express less interest in the behavioral approach to the political process and are more interested in the normative approach, in the discussion of ethical standards of political conduct. It is also reported that students are less interested in public law and public administration and are more interested in comparative politics, American politics, and international politics. It is reported that students are more interested in the substance of policy formulation and program accomplishment and are less interested in political processes and machinery. It is reported that students are more interested in problems and less interested in knowledge for its own intrinsic satisfaction. And it is reported that students are more interested in career opportunities and less interested in the personal satisfaction of intellectual stimulation.

There is another aspect of current student interest which has been noted generally by political science departments. Students are increasingly disposed to prefer interdisciplinary majors rather than majors in political science as such. In large part this preference is an expression

of the attitudes summarized in the preceding paragraph. The most popular interdisciplinary subject of major interest at the present time is reported to be urban affairs, and political science departments are increasingly being drawn into participation in this field of study. Interdisciplinary studies of geographical areas continue to attract student interest, and political science departments have usually participated in these program majors. Black studies have become a relatively new feature of instructional purpose, but it appears that there is some confusion about how political science departments can and should relate to this field of study. In the colleges and universities serving as case studies herein, the tendency has been for black studies to assume status as a separate department rather than as an interdisciplinary major.

If some concern with the interrelationship of political science with other disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences was beginning to appear in the political science departments participating in this study, this concern was being stimulated by student enrollments rather than by faculty interest. Enrollment declines appeared as a threat to the staffing table of a department, and some response was needed in order to justify faculty size. As a consequence, and with some reluctance departments were beginning to search for means to preserve their share of past student enrollment. The cost of this search might be increased interdisciplinary collaboration.

None of the six departments of political science in this study was part of a so-called experimental or innovative college. Representatives of two such colleges were invited, however, to join in the discussion of the case studies. In these innovative colleges one educational objective was to encourage students to become concerned about problems of society, and about the contributions various fields of knowledge might make to the consideration of these problems. Instruction was often handled by a team of faculty members drawn from different disciplines.

In one innovative college the problem areas offered to students for their exploration were: Causality, Freedom, and Chance; Human Development; Individual, Citizen, and State; Space, Time, Form; Political Ecology; Environmental Design; Human Behavior; and Communications and Human Intelligence. In this educational endeavor, the discipline of political science was listed as contributing to the study of five of the eight problem areas. In the other innovative college the faculty members were organized into five schools: Community Sciences, Creative Communication, Environmental Sciences, Human Biology, and Professional Studies. In this organizational structure political science was to

be found as a department within the school of community sciences. On the other hand, the educational objectives of this innovative college were set forth in terms of synthesis, communication-action, environmental control, ecosystems analysis, growth and development, human acceptability, managerial systems, modernization processes, nutritional sciences, population dynamics, regional analysis, and urban analysis. The department of political science was involved in the instructional activity of seven of these fields.

It seems apparent that a radical change in instructional objectives from the exploration of knowledge to the exploration of problems is not readily acceptable to institutions of long standing and to their faculties. It is quite difficult for departments of political science whose faculty members have been preoccupied with the nature of their knowledge about things political now to shift their concern to the nature of public problems and their resolution. There was evidence that this kind of shift was beginning to be discussed among political scientists. But the individual autonomy of faculty members themselves and the individual autonomy of political science departments stood in the way of any substantial change.

There was general agreement in this study that the objective of a liberal education should not be stated as the "transmission" of knowledge. It is often said that the objectives of higher education are the transmission of knowledge, the advancement of knowledge, and the utilization of knowledge. The first of these is then often associated with liberal education. Any such definition would not be acceptable to many political scientists and would not in fact describe what they endeavor to do.

The word *transmission* seems to have a kind of passive connotation, a suggestion of the faculty member as active communicator and of the student as docile recipient of a perceived or revealed wisdom. Neither faculty member nor student today is willing to accept any such definition of roles. Rather faculty members and students in political science look upon themselves as joint participants in a journey of intellectual exploration. Moreover, research by students on at least a modest scale is now considered an important part of the journey, especially in colleges and universities with a selective student body. In addition, some activity of a public service nature—an internship in political party activity, in governmental affairs, or in public administration— is usually included as a part of an undergraduate education in political science.

To be sure, in this journey of intellectual exploration the faculty member and the student are scarcely equal partners. Political scientists

are not disposed to consider students as having the same breadth and depth of knowledge and experience as they themselves possess. Furthermore, in recent years some political science faculty members have been inclined to oppose the disposition of some students to regard student experience and emotions as the equivalent of scholarly knowledge, or equally as worthy of consideration. The student is expected to learn under the guidance of the faculty member, not just react.

One political scientist recently has presented his "political analysis" of higher education.[7] The thesis of Professor Lowi of Cornell University was that the services rendered by a university, including the service of educating students, involve the university in "collective institutionalized commitments to society."[8] In the discussion of this proposition, Professor Lowi presented a table setting forth certain educational norms, educational ethics, and the social interest associated with each. Thus he presented the educational norm of a liberal arts education as entailing an educational ethic of the Renaissance man or of the genteel tradition, and associated this norm with the social interest of the "old bourgeoisie." Similarly, he presented an educational norm labelled "technocratic education" with a problem-solving ethic or service ethic, and associated this norm with the social interest of "regimes."[9] It is not entirely clear what Professor Lowi meant by regimes. He seemed to suggest that a university serves whatever group interest or social class appears to have political power at any particular time.

The political scientists involved in this study disagreed with the propositions of Professor Lowi. Their position was that undergraduate education seeks to develop or advance the faculties of the mind and is not harnessed to a particular political culture or to a particular social class. That there is a linkage between university and society, all of them would acknowledge. It is society which in considerable part provides the support for university instruction, research, and public service. But higher education as an institution is seen as managing a conflict between education and society, between critical intelligence and social performance. In a liberal democracy this role of critical intelligence is held to be essential to social progress and to the preservation of some degree of individual freedom. Political scientists understand their role not in terms of supporting a particular power structure in society but in terms

[7]Theodore J. Lowi, *The Politics of Disorder* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971).
[8]Ibid., p. 125.
[9]Ibid., p. 126.

of supporting a society which values intellectual ability, justice, and human freedom.

In any discussion of the objectives of undergraduate education in political science it is imperative to address the issue of the changing character of higher education in American society. Enrollments in higher education have increased from 238,000 and 4 percent of the 18 through 21 year age group in 1900 to 1,100,000 students in 1930 (12 percent of the 18 through 21 age group), to 1,494,000 students in 1940 (nearly 16 percent of the 18 through 21 age group), to 3,583,000 students in 1960 (38 percent of the 18 through 21 age group), to 7,920,000 students in 1970 (54 percent of the 18 through 21 age group). Regardless of certain qualifications in these data—the growth of graduate education and the appearance of older students overstates the relationship between enrollment and the 18 through 21 year old age group—it is obvious that American higher education has grown in numbers and in the proportion of young people seeking its advantages.

This substantial expansion has necessarily raised a question about the relationship between enrollment and the intellectual standards required in student performance. For the political scientists involved in this study, from selective and less selective and open-door institutions, there was only one possible answer to this question. Higher education in general and political science in particular must continue to enforce standards of student performance. The political scientists rejected the idea that there could be one kind of political science for the students of high academic potential and another kind of political science for students of lesser academic potential. All undergraduate students, regardless of their academic capabilities, it was asserted, should be exposed to a comprehensive vision of things political, should be provided "a taste of the great human reflections on the perennial human political dilemma." What might differ among students of varying abilities would be the extent of the required reading, the scope of vocabulary taken for granted, and the range of historical experience mentioned.

At the same time political scientists in recent years have begun to ask themselves whether or not intellectual objectives alone are sufficient in undergraduate education. In part this questioning results from changing enrollment preferences as expressed by students; in part this questioning results from the changing nature of student enrollments. Whether or not political scientists and other faculty members like the situation, higher education in the United States has increasingly been presented to society as an agency for social mobility, and this social mobility finds

practical expression in employment opportunities for college graduates at average or better-than-average levels of personal remuneration.

Political scientists have been wont to think of their discipline as expanding the intellectual understanding of students, rather than as preparing students for employment. Indeed, in this study it was clear that political science departments as departments did not accept any sense of obligation to find jobs for students. Faculty members did try to help students in obtaining admission to graduate schools and to graduate professional schools. The current inclination to restrict graduate school admissions and the growing pressure of admission applications for law school are creating new concerns for departments of political science. One department in this study as a department had taken steps to warn students early in their undergraduate careers about the difficulties in admission to law schools. A paper had been prepared and distributed to all students enrolled in political science courses explaining the situation of growing numbers of applications for admission to law schools, the limited number of applications which would be accepted, and the kinds of students law schools were inclined to admit. The department believed that it owed this action to its students.

In the meantime political scientists as political scientists are very much concerned about their appropriate response to the career interests of students. The general disposition appears to be one of reasserting the intellectual claims of the discipline and of disregarding the employment preoccupation of so many undergraduate students. But the adequacy of this response is bothersome to some political scientists. They are unhappy with it and yet they are unprepared to offer a viable alternative.

Confronted with this dilemma, there are thoughtful political scientists who see the need for political scientists to join with their colleagues in the arts and sciences in a new declaration of the ends of a liberal education. They would proclaim the distinctive function of the college of arts and sciences to teach students about the various ways of seeking knowledge, of verifying knowledge, and of understanding knowledge. They would have the college of arts and sciences become the unique experience for students in exploring a consciousness of self, a consciousness of historical continuity, a consciousness of social and natural environment. Political scientists with this point of view see their discipline as part of a larger whole which they would designate liberal learning. They see an understanding of things political as indispensable to the education of man's higher faculties, as essential to preparing

man for his role in the ordering of his community, as necessary for man's cultivation of intellectual satisfaction, as helpful for man's enjoyment of the non-necessitous part of his existence.

In the view of some political scientists the discipline of political science has been too preoccupied with scientific method to give proper attention to the great subject of politics. The objective of undergraduate education in political science, accordingly, should be to emphasize the substantive truths about man as a political animal. The objective should be to raise questions and to explore answers about the most vital of human matters, which are how man is to live in community with other men and how man is to achieve material well-being, dignity, and justice for all men. A political science, it is hoped, which saw its purpose in these terms as a part of a greater enterprise called liberal education might reclaim its appropriate place in the undergraduate education of students.

There are individual political scientists prepared to grapple with this vision. But departments of political science as departments appear not yet ready to undertake any collective effort of this kind. Collective effort to establish educational objectives is just not in the pattern of the past performance of departments of political science.

III/Students, Faculty, and Institution

Higher education, and more particularly undergraduate education, is an interaction occurring between students, faculty, and a learning environment. This learning environment is a particular college or university. The students select themselves to enroll in a given college or university. To be sure, the college or university may be selective among the applicants for enrollment, but the first step of application is the consequence of a decision by an individual person. The faculty is made up of those persons who have prepared themselves by education and experience to become instructors and who have been selected to engage in the profession of higher education.

It emerges from the six case studies of undergraduate education in political science that there is indeed diversity in the resources which students and faculty bring to the learning process. This diversity results from certain primary characteristics imposed by the learning environment. And these primary characteristics have to do essentially with student selectivity and financial support in a particular college or university.

There does not appear to be a corresponding diversity, however, in faculty competence and in faculty approach to the instructional process. Faculty members in the discipline of political science have had long educational preparation (most hold the Ph.D. degree except in the community colleges), have had extensive experience in instruction, and have a generally similar commitment to political science as a discipline, even if there are differences in their concept of the knowledge of political science. It is somewhat surprising—at least it was surprising to this author—to find that among quite differend kinds of colleges and universities there were few differences in ideas about desirable undergraduate education in political science.

Among the six institutions whose political science departments were the object of case study, two institutions were highly selective in their initial admission of students, two were moderately selective in their admissions, and two had an open-door for all high school graduates and for those with the equivalency of a high school education. In this context, a high degree of selectivity means that with few exceptions all enrolled students fall in the upper 15.8 percent of student performance

on a standardized test of academic aptitude. A moderately selective admissions practice means that with few exceptions all enrolled students fall at the median or above in their test scores for academic aptitude. In those colleges with an open-door policy of access, any high school graduate without regard to test scores is eligible for admission.

The selectivity of the admissions process affects undergraduate education in political science in several ways. It was reported that students in the highly selective and in the moderately selective learning environment tended to be more interested in active participation in the discussion of political problems than students in the open-door environment. In the highly selective institution, students brought to the classroom a greater background of familiarity with issues and a greater readiness to undertake extensive reading and other instructional activity. In the moderately selective institution there was a greater range in student abilities and interests. In the open-door institution there was not only a still greater range in abilities and interests but also a student attitude such that only a minimum level of academic performance should be expected.

On certain important aspects of undergraduate education, however, all six case studies reported common circumstances confronting the political science departments. One of these was a notable decline in recent years in student interest in abstract thought, in the play of ideas and in the controversy of generalized concepts. Secondly, students tend to be increasingly interested in the knowledge which may help to solve practical problems. Students see little excitement in knowledge as knowledge; on the contrary they want to know how to approach the solution of problems such as poverty, racism, urban congestion, environmental pollution, and international warfare. In the third place, students, in the past year or two in particular, have been inclined to ask: How will this particular knowledge help me to obtain and hold a job; how can I ensure that this study will promote my employment at some kind of worthwhile endeavor?

In the community college with its open admissions policy, some 82 percent of all students were employed, and 59 percent were employed 35 hours or more per week. Nearly half of all students were over 25 years of age. About 30 percent of the students indicated that their family income was under $7,500 a year. Some 51 percent of the students classified themselves as Afro-Americans; 32 percent classified themselves as white Americans. Over half of all student enrollment was to be found in courses offered between 5:00 and 10:00 P.M. About 25 percent of the students terminated their enrollment at the end of one semester

of instruction. About half of all students requested some kind of remedial assistance in order to participate in the learning process.

In addition to the very different academic aptitudes and interests which students brought to the learning endeavor as undertaken by different kinds of institutions, there were differences in the resources devoted to instruction. These differences were revealed by the variations in the size of the political science departments in relation to total institutional enrollment. In varying ways these differences undoubtedly influence the instructional accomplishment in each kind of institution of higher education.

In the major private research university the department of political science consisted of 32 faculty members. The total enrollment of the university was around 12,500 students. There were nine teaching assistant positions in the department. These positions existed to provide some help to faculty members in the performance of their instructional duties. Almost all of the 32 faculty members were engaged in undergraduate instruction; in fact, the department expected each faculty member to teach at least one course for undergraduates. Of all the courses provided by the department, 76 percent were open to undergraduate enrollment.

In the comprehensive state university with a developing program of instruction at the doctoral level, the department of political science consisted of 38 faculty members. The total enrollment of the university was around 25,000 students. The department had 39 teaching assistants, most of whom were involved in the instruction of the introductory course. Most of the faculty members were involved in undergraduate instruction in specialized courses; a proportion was especially interested in the graduate programs. This graduate program was more than a matter of institutional status and prestige; it was also viewed as essential to the instruction of undergraduate students.

In the other four institutions providing the case studies of this survey, the enrollments in political science were entirely undergraduate. In the private endowed college, there was a department of nine faculty members; the total enrollment of the college was around 2,000 students. In the private general college the political science department had a faculty of three members in 1972-73; the total enrollment of the college was 2,600 students (2,200 full-time equivalent students). In the public general college there was a department of political science with three and one-half faculty positions. The total enrollment came to 2,500 students. In the public community college with 10,400 full-time and part-

time students, the faculty positions in political science numbered six.

The private general college in a large urban area was beginning to feel the pressure of enrollment competition from a newly established state university in the same metropolitan community. Because of enrollment losses in 1972 and the expectation of additional enrollment losses in 1973, the size of the political science department was fixed at two faculty positions for the autumn of 1973. The public general college enrolling predominantly a black student body was eager to have enrollment expansion but was finding it difficult to obtain the additional students.

The role of the institution as an institution which emerges from the case studies is one of allocating faculty positions to instructional departments. This allocation is presumably related to the available financial resources of the institution and the proportion of total student enrollment accommodated by the course offerings of the department of political science. In all six instances there was a clearly evident departmental concern with enrollment trends. This was easily understood in the light of the enrollment impact upon the allocation of faculty positions.

The institutional role apart from the allocation of resources appears to be a quite limited one insofar as undergraduate education in political science is concerned. The determination of whether or not instruction shall be restricted to undergraduate education is apparently an institutional decision. If a department desires to expand its program activities to include a graduate program, this kind of decision would require institutional consideration and determination. In a public college or university, such a decision may also be subject to the approval of a state board of higher education.

In addition, the degree requirements for award of an associate degree, a bachelor's degree, and a graduate degree are also fixed on an institutional basis, involving mechanisms of college and faculty action which may eventually be subject to the approval of a board of trustees. Similarly, the distribution and concentration requirements in a degree program were fixed by an institutional decision-making process. And as pointed out earlier, the degree of selectivity exercised in the enrollment of students is an institutional determination, except in those public institutions where this policy may be determined by law. But these kinds of actions seemed to constitute the major impacts of institutional decision-making upon undergraduate education in political science.

The determination of instructional objectives, course offerings, instructional procedures, faculty selection, faculty evaluation, and

faculty promotion was primarily a departmental matter. To be sure, there might be various institutional mechanisms for approving these departmental decisions, but it is evident that these mechanisms are thought of as minor irritants rather than as major constraints. Any failure to obtain institutional consent to such decisions would be considered an improper and unwarranted intrusion upon departmental authority and responsibility. And except in most unusual circumstances, an instructional department expects to be supported in its claim to departmental autonomy by all other instructional departments. A threat to one is a threat to all.

In one instance it was reported that in the middle 1950's the university as a university expressed some dissatisfaction with the scholarly reputation of the department of political science. There followed a kind of university intervention in departmental affairs through which a dean assisted by a faculty committee drawn from outside the department undertook to recruit several new faculty members. No faculty member with tenure was displaced. Rather, new faculty members were brought in who were judged to have achieved scholarly reputations or to have scholarly potentials superior to those of the existing faculty members of the department. When the objective of this university intervention was considered to have been accomplished, or to be well on the road to accomplishment, the department regained full control of its affairs. Indeed, it was conceded that those new faculty members recruited in this unusual way accepted appointment only on condition that the enlarged department would be left free to pursue its own inclinations as to scholarship, including instruction.

The successful accomplishment of the intention of this university intervention in departmental affairs is evidenced, it is asserted, by certain data on scholarly accomplishment. In a recent three-year period ending in June 1972, this department had a record of faculty members who had produced 16 books, 42 papers in major publications, and 25 articles in scholarly journals. Furthermore, the ratings of the department in the two assessments of graduate quality published by the American Council on Education in 1966 and 1970 were also cited as evidence of departmental achievement.

Although data on expenditures per student for undergraduate instruction were not collected in this study—no department appeared to have these data for the department or for the college involved—it was apparent that considerable differentials in expenditure were involved. It seemed likely that expenditures per student, including over-

head, varied from around $900 per student in the community college and around $1,800 in the private general college, the public general college, and the public comprehensive university to around $3,000 per student in the private selective college and the major research university. These are broad generalizations about expenditure levels in the various kinds of institutions but they conform to national experience. They indicate the relative amounts of resources available in various kinds of institutions for undergraduate education in political science.

No matter what may be the particular characteristics of any one college or university, there was no disagreement among the six political science departments about the importance and necessity of departmental autonomy. None of the departments was inclined to question current organizational arrangements which leave fundamental decisions about educational policy and practice to departmental determination. In general, the attitude was that the present state of affairs is the only feasible way in which to carry out undergraduate education in political science.

Moreover, the attitude of concern to preserve existing structures of educational authority was not so much one based upon hostility to administrators as it was one of determination to prevent interference from other disciplines. Whether or not political science is more vulnerable to criticism than other disciplines can only be determined from an extensive study department by department in several different institutions. As we shall note later, political scientists are sensitive about the state of their knowledge about things political. This sensitivity may exist in other disciplines as well. Whatever the explanation, political science departments were not disposed to accept the judgment or advice of any other discipline about content, method of research, or method of instruction. It is the autonomy of the discipline which is at stake in the autonomy of the department.

One finds that there are differences in the way in which political science departments look at the administration of the college or university of which they are a part. There does appear to be a correlation between the size of an institution or of a system and the feeling that administrators were remote from departmental concerns. In the private research university the department of political science perceived the administrative apparatus as primarily supportive, somewhat aloof, and responsive to departmental aspirations within the limits of available resources. On the other hand, in the public community college there appeared to be a considerable rift between faculty and administration. To some extent

this attitude may arise from complexities of collective bargaining. The union of teachers was considered to be protective of teacher interests, and the administration was thought to be anti-union if not anti-faculty. To some extent this division of attitude may also arise from a difference in educational philosophy. Many faculty members considered it to be their proper role to enforce some minimum standard of intellectual performance on the part of all students. There was a suspicion on the part of some faculty members that administrative officers were committed to a concept of educational experience in which no differences in intellectual capacity or performance were to be acknowledged.

In the private selective college there seemed to be a close and friendly relationship between department and administration. Since the president had faculty status in the department, there may have been some disposition to think of him as "one of us." Another possible explanation is that in a smaller, fairly homogeneous educational environment of high intellectual standards, faculty and administrators may tend to develop and to maintain an atmosphere of common interest.

In the public comprehensive university the administration was seen as somewhat remote from departmental activities and preoccupied with the problems of relationship to a governing board having authority over three universities and with the problems of relationship to the state government in general. These problems have been sufficiently vexing in recent years to require considerable attention. Although cognizant of its dependence for its welfare upon the consequences of these relationships, the department of political science seemed to be content to leave the world of administration to administrators and to concentrate its own concern upon the world of political science.

In the instance of the private general college, the faculty members shared with administrators the sense of threat generated by the emergence of a public institution of higher education in the metropolitan area. This sense of threat created more than a sense of anxiety about the future of the institution; it created also a sense of community of interest in which faculty and administrators confronted a common fate.

At the public general college there was again a certain sense of community arising out of the uncertain future of an institution enrolling predominantly black students. The college was well aware that other institutions, public and private, were actively recruiting black students and black faculty members. Enrollment growth for the predominantly black college had been slowed, and the desirable approach to future development was uncertain. Some faculty, administrators, and students

were inclined to believe that a predominantly black institution had cultural, social, and educational advantages for blacks superior to those available in an institution where the black student was in the minority and was continually confronted by a culture which to some extent appeared alien and hostile. Others insisted that a predominantly black public college should become simply a public college. This confusion about goals appeared to generate a community of tension which brought faculty, students, and administrators into a common arena of uncertainty. There was a fear lest internal argument might result in a loss of the capacity for institutional self-determination of the appropriate goal of pursue.

A few words need to be added about the corporate role of the department of political science. This corporate role was almost as limited as the institutional role. The prevailing disposition in large and small departments was to make as few departmental decisions as possible. The reason was two-fold. Each individual faculty member acted upon the assumption that every other individual faculty member in the department was equally competent as a scholar. In addition, there was a disposition to consider lengthy arguments about philosophy of knowledge, about instructional objectives, and about instructional procedures as essentially fruitless. More than this, such discussions were seen as disruptive of the larger aim of the department, which was to pursue the goals of scholarship as each person perceived them.

As a consequence of these attitudes, departments saw their primary task as the exercise of careful selection in the initial determination of those individuals invited to become colleagues. After this initial decision was made, every person in the department was to be treated by all other persons with equal respect and equal deference. The department chairman was thought of not as a decision-maker but as one who handled all the unavoidable paper-work thrust upon the department and who promoted consensus in those few areas of common concern where a common position had to be developed. Usually these common concerns dealt with personnel matters and not with the substance of political science as a discipline or as a field of undergraduate education.

In one instance the comment was made that attempts at departmental decision-making on any important issue—and an important issue was defined as one concerned with the definition of political science knowledge or one concerned with political science research methodology—would have to be resolved at the level of banality or would have to be resolved at the level of civil war. In the interests

of peace and harmony among political scientists, the departments of political science tended to avoid any corporate role. The department existed, particularly in a large institution, as an aggregation of individuals who lived in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance only because no important decisions were ever made affecting the group as a whole.

Insofar as students were concerned, the six departments of political science participating in this study preferred informal to formal relationships. None of the departments had experimented with any structural arrangement for student participation in departmental decision-making. The reason for this circumstance was a simple one. The departments were not anti-student in their attitudes by any means; on the contrary, the faculty members in political science departments indicated a substantial concern with student interests. But a structured participation by students in departmental decision-making was feared by faculty members as the possible introduction of a new scope of collective action. The role of the department, as already indicated, was to avoid decisions, not to enlarge them. Thus student participation appeared as a threat which might present problems for decision rather than just for discussion. The individual faculty members of the department sought to prevent any situation which might require decisions about the substance of scholarship.

On the other hand, a fairly extensive informal consultation between students and faculty members was reported. It is acknowledged that the incidence of this consultation was somewhat uneven, simply because the initiative was left almost entirely to the student. In general, however, the situation as presented by these case studies was quite different from the popular reports which have had so much circulation in recent years. Faculty members appeared not just as accessible to students on an individual basis but as welcoming such contact and as giving a good deal of time to student consultation. There emerges from these studies a composite view of faculty members in political science who are interested in students, eager to be of assistance to students on matters involving the study of political science, and dedicated to the goal of student intellectual development (as each faculty member personally understands such development).

The central observation derived from these case studies is that of the autonomy of the individual faculty member, reinforced by the autonomy of the department. The department of political science brings together an aggregation of individuals bound one to the other by the tie of a common commitment to scholarship. The department certifies

the competence of the faculty member as a scholar. Abstract as the concept may be, the idea of scholarship is the reason for being of the collectivity known as a department of political science. The idea of scholarship is given specific meaning by the individual faculty member. The goal of scholarship is pursued within the context of the faculty member's own definition of learning. The individual faculty member invites the students of the institution where he or she practices this scholarship to join in the exploration of learning. Necessarily, that exploration is limited by the resources of the student and of the institution. The life of scholarship is an individual life. In the discipline of political science and for undergraduate education, the individual faculty member is the principal, the indispensable, actor.

IV/The Curriculum for Undergraduate Education in Political Science

The curriculum offered by a discipline as represented by a department is the operational expression of instructional objectives. The course offerings by departments of political science reflect both the state of knowledge and the individualism of the faculty. Just as departments of political science have found it useful to avoid any orthodoxy other then a commitment to scholarship in the formulation of instructional objectives, so have they found it useful to avoid a standard curriculum.

Some twenty years ago a departmental curriculum for undergraduate education in political science was usually founded upon the psychological assumption that student learning should proceed from the general to the specific. As a consequence, the prevailing practice was to offer an introductory course, a series of so-called core courses (comparative government, international relations, political theory, party politics and public opinion), and a series of specialized courses. The introductory course was frequently a course in American government. It was open to freshmen, and served a dual purpose. It was both a beginning course for the major and a general education course for any undergraduate student fulfilling the distribution requirements for the baccalaureate. Departments of political science saw no reason why the prospective major should be separated from the non-major student at the introductory-level. Secondary education was thought to provide little if any preparation for a scholarly approach to the study of political science, and the introductory course was thought to require the same kind of intellectual concentration for all students, regardless of their previous educational experience.

The core courses and the specialized courses followed in sequence from the introductory course. The core courses were intended to provide a first level of specialization in political science learning, enabling the student to obtain some awareness of the breadth of subject matter interest encompassed by political science. The core courses were available for both the political science major and the major in another social science disciplines who wished to acquire still further knowledge about government. The specialized courses were intended to introduce the various

sub-specializations of political knowledge, primarily for the major in the field.

Departments emphasized the nature of the curriculum by making the introductory course a prerequisite for enrollment in any other political science course. The prospective major was often expected to enroll in perhaps three out of four core courses before he or she might enroll in the specialized courses. Thus the curriculum was constructed around a coherent concept of learning progress and of increasing specialization in handling component parts of the general body of knowledge in political science.

For the most part, this concept of curriculum construction was abandoned during the 1960's by the political science departments participating in this study. A combination of circumstances rendered the apparent coherence of the earlier curriculum dysfunctional. One factor was the changing nature of the student input. In the selective college or university, the entering student was apt to have a fairly good background in political science, acquired from secondary education, the media of mass communication, reading, and family discourse. In less selective colleges and universities there were likely to be some students with the same kind of background as those enrolled in the more selective institutions. Students complained that the introductory course was repetitious, was boring, or was irrelevant. The increased activism of students during the 1960's found a faculty response in the elimination of general education courses, the abandonment of required courses, and the elimination of prerequisite courses.

There were faculty inclinations which corresponded with student criticisms. As political science as a discipline became increasingly fragmented in its philosophy of knowledge and in its methodology of research, the ready solution was for a department to let each faculty member offer such courses as each one thought appropriate to his or her epistemology and to his or her procedure of discovery. If students were dissatisfied with a curriculum based upon the concept of learning which proceeded from the general to the specific, then faculty members in political science were quite satisfied to abandon the whole arrangement.

The consequence has been an undergraduate curriculum in political science which in many institutions simply offers the student a wide array of courses taught with a considerable variation in approach to the exposition of a knowledge about things political. It is then the student's role to select the courses and the faculty members from whom

he or she wishes to learn and with whom he or she wishes to pursue the goal of knowledge. The student is left to achieve such coherence from the pieces as he or she is competent to develop, if we assume that coherence is a desirable characteristic in a body of knowledge labelled political science.

This set of circumstances and this particular curricular practice do not mean that departments of political science no longer offer an introductory course. On the contrary, the departments in this study all offered one or even two introductory courses. What has happened is simply that the introductory course is no longer a required course. Many students continue to enroll in an introductory course, but they do so on a voluntary basis. If a student finds the introductory course repetitious of earlier learning or uninteresting, then the student must have made a poor selection. In one department the variety of choice even goes so far that different faculty members offering the same introductory course with the same general title offer quite different statements of course objectives. The student is then able to make a choice among sections of supposedly the same introductory course based upon the set of objectives which appear to correspond most closely with his or her individual interests.

Departments of political science continue to offer courses which resemble the core courses of an earlier time. Once again, these courses are open to any student, major or non-major, who may wish to enroll. But there is no prerequisite requirement for enrollment in such courses, and the courses themselves are no longer a prerequisite for enrollment in any other political science course. Indeed, for the practical purpose of student enrollment there is not any difference between a core course and a specialized course. There may be a difference in scope and point of view. But the principle of student selection is fully operative. Each individual student makes his or her own curriculum from the variety of courses available for his or her selection. Free choice in course selection has become the curricular principle for undergraduate education in political science.

To be sure, as mentioned earlier, departments of political science do recognize a kind of similarity or grouping among the courses available for undergraduate education. In most instances the major student is required to select a certain proportion of his or her courses from among these groupings. The courses selected are then a matter of individual student choice. The limitation or requirement is that the choice must be spread among groups of courses.

In one department of political science the courses available for undergraduate selection are as follows:

	No. of Courses (not sections)
Introductory	2
International Politics	35
Comparative Politics	28
American Politics	20
Political Theory	15
Public Law	8
Public Administration	7
	115

In this department, which also offered courses for the master's and doctoral degrees, it was found that the undergraduate courses actually made up 76 percent of all departmental course offerings. Yet in terms of degrees awarded, the university distribution was approximately 60 percent undergraduate and 35 percent graduate and graduate professional. For a major in political science the student was required to offer a total of 45 units of study from a total of 180 units for the baccalaureate. The student had to have enrolled for courses in four out of the six groupings (other than the introductory course). This meant that the major student at the minimum might have enrolled in 15 of the 115 courses available for his or her selection.

While the data just cited are the maxima in this study, they are not unrepresentative. They indicate the prevailing pattern of course offerings and course selection for undergraduate education in political science. Colleges and universities with lower enrollments and less financial resources necessarily offer fewer courses. But the general objective is the same: to offer as much variety in course selection as the personnel resources of the department make possible.

There are other aspects of curriculum practice which should be observed. The political science curriculum is developed by the political science faculty of a college or university. Perhaps a more accurate description would be to say that the curriculum is "put together" by the political science department. Although there are requirements that courses be approved by college bodies or agents, it is obvious that these requirements are almost entirely a matter of routine procedure. There was almost no evidence that colleges of arts and sciences had articulated

any goals or standards which would permit a substantive evaluation of a departmental curriculum, which would permit a college-wide decision as to what would constitute a desirable undergraduate curriculum.

For example, in his study of undergraduate education, Daniel Bell set forth an outline of a curriculum which would meet the requirements of both a general and a liberal education.[1] No doubt many faculty members in a college of arts and sciences and in a department of political science would find this curriculum unsatisfactory, even inadequate to their own sense of desirable undergraduate educational experience. The point is that Professor Bell set forth a general pattern of course offerings providing a coherent endeavor to achieve the objectives of a liberal learning. But colleges of arts and sciences as observed in this study had not established any such general pattern and apparently were not about to do so.

Moreover, just as the various departments in the social and behavioral sciences had established no common educational objectives, so they had not established any common curricular arrangements. When and if a college of arts and sciences agrees to establish an interdisciplinary major, the prevailing practice is to indicate the course offerings of individual departments which will satisfy the needs of the major. On occasion, a department of political science will decide that one or more new courses should be offered as a contribution to an interdisciplinary major. But the practice is essentially one of offering departmental courses which will fit into an interdisciplinary field of study rather than a group of departments in concert establishing a single set of course offerings. Of course, there may be informal and even casual discussions between faculty members of one department with faculty members of another department about common interests. The prevailing practice, however, is to express these common interests in terms of the courses taught by an individual faculty member under the aegis of an individual department. Curriculum construction in political science is primarily curriculum construction by an individual faculty member of political science, the courses of all individual political scientists constituting the course offerings of the department of political science.

It is worthy of note that in the two instances where departments of political science did not exist as such but constituted a group within a division of the social sciences, the group still behaved as if it were indeed a department. Not only was there an absence of any instructional

---

[1]Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-273.

objectives developed on a division-wide basis, but also there was virtually complete autonomy for the group in determining the courses to offer. The only limitation was one of available personnel and of work load.

Departments of political science offer courses involving independent reading, off-campus experience, project activity, seminar discussion, and honors. There has been somewhat greater student interest recently in off-campus experience and in project activity than in courses requiring extensive reading or preparation of a research paper. Some departments have had a decline in the past three or four years in the number of majors who pursue honors work in political science.

One department had experimented with a course in political science which was in effect an internship in legal practice. The department worked out an arrangement with a number of law partnerships to permit students to do some legal research for them. In general, students were not paid for this work, although summer employment had on occasion resulted from the arrangement. The purpose was to acquaint students through first-hand observation of the nature of legal practice. The course had proven to be quite effective in the judgment of the political science department.

In another instance a department obtained a grant from the National Science Foundation to undertake a study of voting behavior in a major urban area. The project had also been organized as an undergraduate course and a major purpose of the endeavor was to give students first-hand experience in the collection and analysis of statistical data. It was hoped that the students participating in the project would be especially inclined to go ahead for graduate study in political science.

Departments of political science enrolling students on a non-selective or less selective basis have found in the past few years that many of their students did not have an adequate background in reading and in use of the English language to maintain the instructional pace appropriate for other students. These departments often lacked the resources to offer distinctive courses for these students. The choice then became one of providing additional supplementary instruction or of slowing down the pace of instruction for all students. Confronted with this choice, many faculty members preferred to offer the additional instruction in what amounted to an extra class meeting each week. This practice entailed an additional instructional burden for faculty members, but some political scientists had willingly assumed the load.

Almost without exception the prevailing practice in all the departments of this study was to open every course to any undergraduate

student who wished to enroll. In terms of course offerings and course enrollment, no distinction was made between the major and the non-major. In practice, departments found that the more specialized courses tended to enroll only students pursuing a major in political science. Specialized courses involving seminar discussion and honors work in particular were likely to enroll only the student major. But in their course offerings departments preferred not to limit enrollment to students who were considered to be majors in political science. Faculty members recognized that on occasion the interest of the non-major in a particular subject might be different from that of the major. Nonetheless, the prevailing position was that both interests should be accommodated in the same course.

In one college the department of political science offered a course for seniors which was in effect a course for the best majors, those students with a very good academic record in political science courses. In this way the department endeavored to give some special recognition and special attention to these particular students, regardless of their career objectives.

In one instance, that of the public community college, there was an apparent disposition on the part of the faculty, particularly in the light of their own experience in graduate education, to want to offer courses which tended to be appropriate for an idealized view of what the college student ought to be rather than appropriate for the actual student who did enroll. Faculty members had had to learn to adjust their course offerings and their course content to the abilities and the needs of the actual student of the college. The process of adjustment had not been easy, but faculty members had in most instances made an effort to change. In some instances faculty members had proven quite adept in altering course content to correspond more nearly to the background of their students. In a few instances, faculty members and students had never found a common basis for communication.

In a community college system, moreover, it was reported to be somewhat difficult to obtain approval for new course offerings. The curriculum as originally developed therefore tended to be quite stable. Faculty members simply adjusted the content of their courses rather than course titles. Any resemblance between the two might be purely coincidental.

One college had experimented with the idea of a freshman seminar in political science which concentrated attention upon the consideration of some problem of public policy. These seminars enrolled not more

than 17 students, and the students were able to express some preference about how the declared problem should be explored. The experiment had not been underway for a sufficient number of years to enable the department members to come to a definite conclusion about its effectiveness as an introduction to political science. There was a disposition to believe that the freshman seminar was worthwhile in terms of a small class available to the ablest and most interested first-year students. The freshman seminar, however, did not displace the introductory course. A more traditional course for introductory purposes continued to be offered.

There was an awareness in political science departments that courses had tended to become more and more highly specialized, and to become more and more numerous. As enrollments began to stabilize in some colleges and universities in 1971 and 1972, there had been some inclination upon the part of college deans and university vice-presidents, reinforced by their curriculum committees, to insist that when a new course was proposed some existing course had to be eliminated. The essential constraint in further course proliferation, however, was the stabilization in the number of faculty places in the manning table of political science departments.

It was apparent that some new curriculum pressures might be ahead for departments of political science. These would be pressures to reduce course offerings as costs of instruction continued to increase, as enrollments began to level off, and as faculty expansion came to a halt. Political science departments as departments were only beginning to worry about the impact of these changing circumstances in the academic year 1972-73.

V/Instructional Practices and Resources

The departments of political science participating in this study employed a wide variety of instructional practices. No department had endeavored to establish common standards for instructional procedure, but each left the selection of an appropriate learning process to the faculty member responsible for offering a particular course. Nor did departments as departments undertake to evaluate the effectiveness of various instructional practices. The instructional procedures reported by the various departments had one and only one characteristic in common: in each instance the principle of "classroom sovereignty" of the individual faculty member was recognized and practiced.

It was generally agreed that the preferable classroom procedure was that of the discussion group, a course or section of 20 or fewer students where faculty-student interaction was the mode. It is part of the folklore of faculty behavior to insist that the small group discussion method is the most satisfactory arrangement for student learning, for joint student-faculty consideration of the issues involved in political behavior and in our knowledge about such behavior. Even faculty members who are quite skilled in the lecture procedure tend to assert that they would prefer to teach in small groups. The absence of the necessary personnel resources in terms of faculty positions is given as the reason why all classes are not taught in this particular way.

In the consideration of instructional practices by the six departments, there was a general consensus that when courses or sections enrolled over 30 students, a faculty member had very little choice except to make use of the lecture method. Furthermore, it was acknowledged that some faculty members were quite adept in the use of this procedure, providing students with a considerable insight about things political and at the same time arousing a great deal of student interest. The faculty member who was not a successful lecturer will soon be without the student enrollment in a course or section which justifies the lecture method. For this reason department chairmen were often under pressure not to announce in a catalogue or in advance which sections or which courses would be instructed by which faculty members. Wherever lecture ses-

sions were quite large, they were supplemented by small discussion groups or by the preparation of papers.

In recent years in particular, it was pointed out that student preferences had favored the small class-discussion group process of learning. *Especially in the highly selective institutions, where almost all students* have been admitted from the top 16 percent of all college-bound students in terms of their scholastic aptitude, students insist that they want and should have an active part in the learning process. These students in general prefer to avoid the lecture method. They insist that their courses should provide an opportunity for the student to express his or her attitudes and beliefs about political behavior.

At the same time, it was acknowledged in this study that faculty preferences, although often not expressed in explicit terms, favored the lecture method. In the three institutions which might be considered as having a predominantly instructional orientation, the lecture method was employed because of limited faculty resources. In the three institutions where faculty members were much concerned with research and public service in addition to instruction, the lecture method was employed in order to free faculty time for these non-classroom activities. Out of a "normal" faculty work week of from 45 to 50 hours devoted clearly to educational duties, faculty members are likely to want at least 20 hours to be available for research, public service, and general institutional activity. If 25 hours a week is to be devoted to classroom work, including student consultation, then two courses constitutes the desirable work-load. When faculty members offer only two courses each, then course enrollments tend to increase in size.

In the less selective institutions faculty members reported that student attitudes also encouraged the faculty member to do most of the talking in a classroom situation. The students seemed to say in effect that they expected the faculty member to know a great deal more than they did and it was the job of the faculty member to share his or her knowledge with the students. These students had done little reading about politics in the past and were not inclined to do any considerable amount of reading while enrolled in higher education. Thus student learning became mostly a kind of verbal learning, a learning acquired from the words of the faculty member.

The faculty classroom work-load in the various institutions was a combination of three factors: the number of different courses offered, the number of sections of the same course offered, and the number of students enrolled in each course or section. There appeared to be

no common procedure among the departments in calculating or quantifying this work-load. The obvious calculation would be student credit hours or units of instruction produced by each faculty member. But this calculation would not provide an appropriate differentiation in faculty work-load between the instruction of two different courses and the instruction of two sections of the same course.

Within the same department where there were a large number of faculty positions (9 to 38), there was a considerable variation in the work-load of individual faculty members. The prevailing attitude among the faculty of these departments was that such variation could not be avoided. Some faculty members were more popular with students than other members. Some faculty members were more proficient in research than in instruction. Some faculty members were more proficient in lecturing than others. The objective of a "good" department of political science, it was argued, was not to achieve a uniform work-load among faculty members—even if everyone was agreed what a uniform work-load meant. The objective was to offer a wide range of subject matter courses and of methodological approaches for the understanding of things political.

As indicated earlier, certain kinds of courses implied or required certain kinds of instructional procedures. Honors courses, special reading courses, internship courses, research courses—the nature of these courses prescribed the nature of the instructional process. Honors courses were conducted on a tutorial basis. Reading courses entailed independent study and the preparation of written reports. Internship courses involved work experience, with some review of that work experience by an immediate supervisor and perhaps a review by a group of interns having similar experiences. Research courses involved some degree of individual student exploration of a particular phase of knowledge, often involving an oral report to a group of students and a faculty member in addition to a written report. All of these devices had been employed by the six departments of political science in this study. All were considered to have been effective to some degree in promoting or encouraging student learning.

It is evident that there was variety also in the use of instructional materials. In the selective institutions textbooks were frequently not used in political science courses. Rather, the students were expected to do a good deal of reading in monographic literature and in other literature (such as the Federalist Papers and deTocqueville). The tendency was to read materials which were available in paperback editions and

which could be purchased at reasonable prices by students. Students complained when expected to read such materials in the college library that the books were lost or never available. In the less selective institutions textbooks were still much in use, especially in introductory courses. Here it was reported that students had the attitude that if they read one text and attended all the class sessions, they had done all that could reasonably be expected of them.

In the large comprehensive public university an introductory course was offered by closed-circuit television. A senior faculty member who was quite skilled in lecturing presented two 30-minute lectures a week. These lectures were viewed in small sections of students with a graduate assistant present. The 20 minutes of time remaining in the class period were utilized for discussion; in addition, each section met once each week for a full 50-minute class period devoted solely to discussion led by the graduate assistant. The use of closed-circuit television rather than the large lecture hall was preferred in this instance because the format provided a small grouping of students, permitted some discussion, and enabled the senior faculty member to obtain some feedback about student attitudes and concerns through the graduate assistants.

The position of this department of political science was that the instructional procedure employed in the introductory course represented the most effective method of instruction available to it, given the constraints of large enrollment, limited state government appropriation support for instruction, and low tuition charges to students. This particular state university, like other state universities in that state and elsewhere, had had to absorb most of the enrollment increase in higher education which had occurred during the decade of the 1960's. For this reason, instructional procedures had to be adapted to the enrollment and financial circumstances confronting the state university. On a purely subjective basis—no controlled experiment had been undertaken to obtain factual data on a comparative basis—faculty members of the department expressed the belief that they had developed a satisfactory instructional procedure for offering the introductory course.

One department of political science reported that it had undertaken some experimentation in programmed learning but had reached the conclusion that the endeavor was not effective as an instructional procedure. In this instance the student body was not a selective one and the department had come to realize that programmed learning requires a considerable motivation and self-discipline on the part of students if the procedure is to be effective. This department had the experience

that each faculty member had to devote a good deal of effort to encouraging students to study. Some students even expressed the attitude that if they attended class sessions they should not be expected to read any materials outside the classroom. They seemed to believe that learning was a classroom process, not a reading process.

It was reported that some faculty members in various departments had made considerable use of film strips, audio-visual materials, charts and maps, and motion pictures. No department reported any such carefully formulated set of instructional procedures and utilization of instructional materials as had been developed by a faculty member in the department of political science at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.[1] For many higher education students of limited motivation and of limited intellectual resources there may be a need for instructional procedures and instructional materials more closely associated with the communication techniques of the mass media than are the conventional instructional procedures.

None of the departments involved in this study had utilized any formal or experimental method for evaluating the instructional effectiveness of different classroom procedures. Faculty members apparently saw no particular advantage to themselves individually or collectively in any such evaluation effort. Indeed, the whole idea of evaluation of instructional procedure seemed to be foreign to the way of thinking characteristic of political scientists. If institutional resources had been available for the evaluation of instructional procedures, political scientists would prefer to utilize these resources to advance their knowledge of politics. To the political scientist knowledge about things political is his or her overwhelming preoccupation.

On the other hand, it is also clear that student evaluation of faculty members has now become a commonly accepted practice. This acceptance does not mean that political scientists like the practice, or agree with it. This acceptance simply means that student evaluation of instruction is now a widespread student demand, and this demand has been acquiesced in by political science faculty members. The prevailing arrangement seems to be to give a course evaluation form, often developed on an institution-wide basis, to students at the end of each semester or quarter. The evaluation forms are reviewed by the individual faculty member for such benefit as he or she may obtain, or accept, from them. The forms are then usually filed with the department chair-

[1]Cf. Dick Simpson, *Who Rules?* Introduction to the Study of Politics, second revised edition (Chicago: The Swallow Press, Inc., 1973).

man and retained for a time. This student evaluation information may be used when a department chairman and departmental committee are considering the matter of tenure, promotion, and salary increase for each individual faculty member of the department.

It was universally accepted that the primary, the indispensable, instructional resource of a department of political science was the individual faculty member. Every phase of faculty personnel practice was crucial to the performance achievements of a department. The personnel procedure began with initial recruitment but extended throughout the entire range of personnel actions involving tenure, promotion, compensation, work-load, work performance, professional development, and termination.

The one critical personnel decision which the departments of political science found that they could not control was that of the number of faculty positions available to them. The staffing table was a college or university decision, the basic decision the institution made. Other personnel decisions might require college or university approval, but this approval was considered usually to be a routine act. To be sure, the resources available annually for increases in faculty compensation were determined by the institution rather than the department. The application of these resources to individual faculty members, however, was ordinarily handled through departmental mechanisms.

Departments of political science recognized that there were three primary bases upon which to build a recruitment process. One was to recruit faculty members in accordance with a predetermined scheme of desirable fields of specialization or methodological approaches to political science. The second was to take advantage of unusual opportunities when some outstanding scholar was available for appointment. A third was to recruit some particular person in conjunction with a special research grant or other unusual set of circumstances, including opportunities for joint appointment with another institution or even with another college in the same university.

In a large department, personnel decisions were usually made by a personnel committee over which the department chairman presided. This committee might be comprised of five persons, at least four of whom would be senior members of the department. Sometimes the issue of compensation was handled separately from other matters of personnel (appointment, tenure, promotion, and termination); in these instances compensation matters were generally handled by a departmental executive committee.

The dean of a college within a university might be advised by an appointments and promotions committee, and the vice-president for academic affairs might be advised by a faculty advisory committee. These committees were mostly concerned with some degree of uniform practice among various departments. Seldom were these committees disposed to dispute a departmental judgment as presented to them by a department chairman. Occasionally, when word of some controversy within a department reached the ears of a college or university personnel committee—and word about disagreements almost always did reach the committee—committee members might be inclined to ask questions and even to make an independent judgment. For this reason an astute department chairman would try to gain a consensus within the department of political science before presenting any personnel recommendations to a dean or to an academic vice-president for approval.

Departments of political science, like other departments, are today much concerned about the opportunities for future recruitment. Currently, it was reported, faculty recruitment was almost entirely on a replacement basis. This meant that as vacancies occurred because of retirement or resignation, a department would try to hang on to the position in its staffing table and would then try to agree upon the field of specialization which was in the greatest need of strengthening at the moment. Unusual opportunities to recruit personnel might still occur, but the resources with which to take advantage of those opportunities had largely disappeared.

Some departments of political science were quite concerned about their staffing pattern. In one department the distribution of faculty members by rank as of 1972-73 was as follows:

	Percent
Professor	53
Associate Professor	18
Assistant Professor	18
Instructor	11

Moreover, in this department 71 percent of the faculty members were on tenure, constituting all the positions in the ranks of associate professor and of professor. The department was concerned about its future personnel actions under these circumstances, but was disposed to believe that the university would have to establish some standards before any departmental planning could be undertaken. For the present, departments consider that they have been caught in a holding pattern. The future seems most uncertain.

Aside from faculty personnel recources, departments of political science were generally concerned about office space, library holdings, and faculty support. Computer centers were generally available at the present time and there were no complaints that computing facilities were not meeting current demands upon them as generated by departments of political science. Classroom space was also considered to be generally satisfactory, except in one instance. Library holdings were thought to be generally adequate, although some concern was expressed about the loss of volumes which library officials were often unwilling or unable to replace. Two common complaints persisted in every instance. Faculty office space was inadequate, and faculty support in the form of secretarial assistance was scarce. Faculty members also desired more research and travel support.

All departments of political science expressed grave concern, as indicated earlier, about the probable trend in future course enrollments. At the public community college there was an evident trend for students to be more and more interested in the career programs rather than in the college transfer program. This implied that courses in political science might continue largely as a general education component to career education. In the four-year institutions enrollment growth appeared to have slowed down if not stabilized by the autumn of 1972. But even more threatening to departments of political science was the prospect that they might not continue to enroll their previous share of students.

The prospect of reduced enrollments in political science presented the possibility of reduced personnel and other resources for a political science department. This actually had happened at one institution included in this study. The same event was feared in other institutions.

As a consequence, departments of political science by the end of the academic year 1972-73 were asking: How do we preserve and even advance our enrollments in political science? The answers being explored had to do mostly with matters of student financial support and even matters of admission policies. The possibilities of curriculum reconstruction and of changes in instructional procedures were not receiving very much attention. The crisis had not yet advanced to the stage where collective departmental action requiring general agreement by all departmental faculty members was possible or acceptable.

VI/By Way of Conclusion

It remains to ask just what are the principal inferences which one might deduce from these data about the state of undergraduate education and about the state of higher education institutions for undergraduate education. There are several such inferences, it seems to the author, and these deserve some mention even if they are not discussed in the detail and the length which the seriousness of the issues clearly warrants.

We must necessarily begin with a first question, a question which is almost never asked by political scientists or by others in the higher education community. What is the claim of political science upon the attention of an undergraduate student? What is the distinctive contribution a study of political science offers to the undergraduate student? Why should the undergraduate study political science? No matter how the question is worded, the question itself must be answered and answered explicitly.

Aristotle wrote that man is by nature a political animal. That simply stated proposition has been the basis of continued discussion in Western thought for over 2,000 years. No person can claim to be educated in Western culture who is not familiar with the landmark endeavors to explore, to understand, and to evaluate the political experience of man in Western society since the days of the Greek City-State.

Political science as a body of thought has encountered certain major complexities. Regardless of what intellectuals and scholars may say and write about man's political activities, those activities of necessity continue and change. Political reality and political thinking are not the same thing. Political reality is an ongoing social process. Political thinking is an intellectual attempt to understand that process. Presumably one objective in political thinking is to achieve as close a concordance as possible between intellectual understanding and the reality of the process. But there is another objective in Western political thought, and that is to achieve improvement in political society. How can man by rational thought affect political action to ensure that the political process shall achieve liberty, justice, and the pursuit of happiness for all men?

On the one hand, the political scientist faces a challenge in epistemology and in metaphysics. On the other hand, the political scientist faces the challenge of how man can utilize thought to help achieve certain great political ends presumed to enjoy widespread acceptance. The political scientist is supposed to know the realities of the political process, to comprehend purpose in the political process, and to engineer a harmony of purpose and process. And the truth is that on all three counts the political scientist today, like the intellectuals of the past 2,300 years, has an imperfect knowledge of the realities of process, professes an uncertain faith about purpose, and has only a modest record of achievement as a designer of the artifacts of government.

There is a very real danger, particularly when half or more of all young people in society may have access to higher education, that political science may develop at the least an indifferent anti-intellectualism in the young, and at the worst an active cynicism about all human political behavior. Why should man not have more accomplishment to demonstrate the worth of 23 centuries of political discussion? Why do intellectuals speak about ideals of political behavior and then man in society violates those ideals in actual practice? Why does man's behavior seem to be so little influenced by man's thought?

The very same questions which trouble the political scientist are equally troublesome for the philosopher, the historian, the artist, the dramatist, the author, and the man of religion. Similar questions undoubtedly trouble other scholars of the social and behavioral sciences: the anthropologist, the economist, the social psychologist, and the sociologist. The political scientist does not wander alone in the wilderness of thought and hope.

The distinctive contribution of the political scientist to undergraduate education is his or her role as the conserver and transmitter of a great tradition of intellectual discourse. At the same time it is befitting the nature of the discipline for the political scientist to acknowledge the limitations of his or her knowledge, and the limited role of knowledge in the on-going affairs of man. Life, including social life, proceeds whether or not we understand it or can cope with its pathology.

Surely this distinctive contribution has an appropriate place in the content of an undergraduate education. The college student can no more afford to be ignorant about man in society, including political society, than he or she can afford to be ignorant about man as a person, man as a part of biological life, and man as part of a physical environment.

There can be no undergraduate education worthy of the label of higher education which does not have a place for political science.

At the same time it is high time for the political scientist as teacher of undergraduate students to become more concerned with the purpose of liberal learning than with the nature of his or her knowledge about things political. Perhaps a better way to state the proposition would be say that as a teacher of undergraduates a preoccupation with the objective of a liberal learning should take priority for the political scientist over the objective of scientific precision in political knowledge.

One of the disquieting discoveries of this study has been to observe the extent to which the concerns of graduate education with the nature of man's knowledge about things political has come to dominate undergraduate education in political science. Criticism of the impact of graduate education upon undergraduate education is by no means new.[1] Yet it is clear from this record that the concerns of the political science scholar as reflected in graduate education have come in large measure to determine the content of undergraduate education in political science.

It will be pointed out of course that graduate education should have its impact upon undergraduate education. The conjunction of both enterprises within a university is supposed to provide benefits to both the undergraduate and the graduate student. If one of the purposes of undergraduate education is to acquaint students with the methods of conceptualization, as is often asserted, then the work of graduate education in political science must affect the instruction of undergraduate students. It is research and research procedure, frequently as developed in graduate schools, which in considerable part provide the content for undergraduate education.

On the other hand, the fault in this assessment of the linkage of graduate education in political science with undergraduate education in political science is simply its lack of historical perspective. A major objective in undergraduate education is an awareness of the history of man's thought over centuries of time, not just the past three or four decades. The preoccupation of graduate education with a particular kind of science in political science during the past 30 years is scarcely an adequate perspective about the nature of man's thought about the nature of things political since the time of Plato and Aristotle.

---

[1]Cf. for example, Oliver C. Carmichael, *Graduate Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961); and Earl J. McGrath, *The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1959).

Undergraduate education, especially undergraduate education in the liberal tradition, has its own imperatives. These imperatives are not fashioned by the nature of graduate education. These imperatives, which must necessarily draw upon the product of graduate education, find their substance in an ancient and honorable intellectual tradition, of which a concern with things political has always been an important part.

There is another aspect of undergraduate education in political science which requires mention. There is an apparent tension between the discipline of political science and the department of political science. The discipline of political science is a national and international network of faculty members and others drawn together by their common concern with the subject matter of the discipline and by their common concern to advance their collective professional interests as they perceive them. Departments of political science are organizational units of separate and varied colleges and universities which enroll students, offer courses of instruction, award degrees, and manage a learning environment. The discipline of political science has essentially a national and international point of view. The discipline is dominated by professional interest. The department of political science is expected to have a local or institutional point of view. The department is dominated by institutional interest.

The common assumption of political scientists is that there is no conflict between the interest of the discipline of political science and the interest of a department of political science as part of a college or university. Indeed, political scientists commonly assume that there is a complete compatibility and harmony between the discipline of political science and a department of political science in the structural arrangement of a college or university.

I believe the evidence set forth in the case studies of six departments of political science reveals that this compatibility is achieved almost entirely by the dominance of the discipline over the department. As a collection of scholars joined together in a department of political science, faculty members perceive their professional role in terms of the discipline, not in terms of a faculty role in a particular college or university. The interests of the discipline take priority over the interests of the college or university. This circumstance is demonstrated by the approach of political science faculty members in general to the problems of objectives and process in general education and in liberal education for undergraduate students. Furthermore, the limited approach of faculty mem-

bers in political science toward the new enrollment and financial complexities of colleges and universities similarly suggests a preoccupation with professional rather than institutional interests.

Perhaps in the decade of the 1970's there will be some alteration or adjustment in the ways in which political scientists in colleges and universities perceive their respective roles in terms of the interests of the discipline of which they are a part and in terms of the interests of the college or university of which they are a part. The action of the American Political Science Association in creating a Division of Educational Affairs may be a harbinger of changing attitudes and new actions. The changes resulting from events of the 1970's must be awaited.

One major concern for both political scientists and for colleges and universities is how to bring about desired change. Political scientists who have studied change in the body politic might be expected to have a contribution to make toward change within a discipline and within a department. A political knowledge which perceives political action primarily in terms of the interests of various groups of persons would postulate that a change of behavior can be accomplished only through a change in the awareness of group interests. A political knowledge which perceives political action primarily in terms of leaders and of social elites would postulate that a change of behavior can be accomplished only through innovative endeavors by certain individuals. A political knowledge which perceives political action primarily in terms of the economic motivation of groups of persons would postulate that a change of behavior can be accomplished only through a change in economic rewards. A political knowledge which perceives political action primarily in terms of social response to changes in man's circumstances and technology would postulate a change in academic behavior resulting from changes in the forces affecting higher education.

How can political scientists be persuaded to give increased attention to undergraduate education in terms of the student and in terms of institutional objectives rather than in terms of the discipline of political science? One possible answer may be a period of time in which the attention of political scientists is increasingly focused upon a concern with students and with institutions of higher education. Another possible answer is for the discipline of political science to encourage experimentation and innovation in developing the relationship of undergraduate education as a whole. And yet another possible answer is for colleges and universities as institutions to seek increased funds and to use these

to encourage the efforts of faculty members, including political scientists, who wish to develop change in undergraduate education.

The broader vision of undergraduate education which moves beyond a preoccupation with the education of undergraduate students in the subject matter of a particular discipline can only be realized when faculty members see their roles as professors of a college or university rather than as scholars of political science. Furthermore, faculty members can by no means separate themselves from the goals of students. The prevailing philosophy of education practiced by political scientists is that undergraduate students seek knowledge for its own intrinsic worth, for its own personal satisfaction to the individual. That this philosophy might be closely related to a class structure and to an economy no longer in existence is seldom acknowledged, even though it is a political scientist, Professor Lowi, who has pointed out the possible linkage. Student objectives may be much more closely allied to employment, social mobility, and the handling of public problems than they are to the understanding of knowledge for its own sake.

The reconstruction of political science as a part of undergraduate education will be inextricably intertwined with a reconstruction of general education and of liberal education. The political scientist cannot meet the needs of the undergraduate student or the objectives of undergraduate education by himself or herself. The political scientist is a participant in undergraduate education, but he or she is a participant who must necessarily join with his or her colleagues in other disciplines in order to provide both the design and the content for undergraduate education. The political scientist is an essential participant in undergraduate education; he or she cannot become the only specialist in that endeavor.

The reconstruction of general education and of liberal education is no simple task for colleges and universities. The temper of the times and the impact of enrollment change upon higher education ought to be apparent to all faculty members by this time, except perhaps those isolated in institutions with enrollments drawn only from the top 16 percent of all youth in terms of academic aptitude. These are not days propitious for intellectual endeavor pursued for its own intrinsic worth. The concept of a general education and the concept of a liberal education are on the defensive, not just the practice of undergraduate education in political science.

Moreover, the department of political science will need to become a different kind of organizational unit. Within the graduate school of

a research university, the department of political science is primarily a research unit, engaged in the advancement of knowledge about things political and in the education of apprentice scholars. One might hope that departments of political science in other universities would see their purpose in terms of the study of political science as a process of undergraduate education rather than in terms of the study of political knowledge as a discipline. The department of political science as a participant in undergraduate education is a resource unit which must be prepared to offer its expertise in knowledge about things political to the pursuit of the purposes of general and liberal education. There is a need for two kinds of political science departments, or for departments of political science which clearly differentiate their roles in graduate education and undergraduate education.

It is not enough that a group of political scientists calling themselves a department should find their common ground in a commitment to the importance of knowledge about things political and in a devotion to a concept of scholarship diligently practiced. It is not enough for undergraduate education with its distinctive purposes. It is not enough for undergraduate students who are entitled to guidance as well as a sharing. The prevailing idea about undergraduate education in political science appears to be an endeavor to expose the student to as wide an array of courses as possible, courses which offer different definitions of knowledge, different concepts of knowledge, different methodological approaches to knowledge. It is the student rather than the faculty member who is expected to discover some coherence in this array.

Departments of political science seem disposed to believe that their status and role within a college or university is not unique. They perceive other departments representing other disciplines as equally jealous of their departmental autonomy, equally protective of each individual faculty member, equally inclined to develop individual approaches to the definition of knowledge. Departments of political science sense that their collective decision-making, such as it is, is not in essence different from that of other departments.

Nor are political scientists as individuals inclined to worry in particular about the needs and interests of undergraduate students. The political scientist tends to be repelled by any suggestion that he or she owes the undergraduate student any orthodoxy of political knowledge. The political life of man is full of uncertainties. Why then should not the intellectual life of man in its knowledge about things political be also full of uncertainties. Learning to live with intellectual uncertainty

is a major part of undergraduate education. The present kind of varied curriculum in political science provides the experience of intellectual uncertainty.

Furthermore, student activism during the 1960's has been used by many faculties as a reason to justify current instructional practices in undergraduate education. The response of college and university faculties to student criticism was not to reconstruct curricula; the response was to drop degree requirements which had previously tried to define a general education, a liberal education, and undergraduate specialization. The principle of curriculum electives became a new principle of undergraduate education in the arts and sciences: let the student construct his or her own curriculum, with a minimum of nonsense about distribution and concentration.

It will be no easy task for either departments of political science or all departments in the arts and sciences to begin to think in different terms about the purposes and processes of undergraduate education. There have been many years when such thinking as was devoted to general education and to liberal education was indulged in only by "educationists." Such thinking, it was said, was not appropriate for a scholar preoccupied as he or she was with his own specialized, exacting, and esoteric knowledge. A generation or more of practice in undergraduate education will not readily be changed.

It must be emphasized that colleges and universities themselves have done little to define educational goals, objectives, and programs. Two forces developed, particularly after 1945, to emphasize the autonomy and isolation of disciplines within the operational context of a college or university. One of these was the "academic revolution" which saw the individual faculty member and the departmental aggregation of faculty members emerge as the power base of the academic enterprise.[2] The other was the "dualism" of power structure within college and university administration which recognized a sharp differentiation between things academic and things institutional.[3] This kind of dualism in power structure, along with the disposition of faculty members to pursue the interests of their disciplines rather than the interests of their institutions, made any endeavor to achieve coherence and unity in undergraduate education virtually impossible.

---

[2]Cf. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968).

[3]Cf. John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960).

It would be comforting and reassuring to enthusiasts for educational change, especially to enthusiasts for changes in undergraduate education, to believe that the current period of uncertainty and of questioning about higher education and higher education institutions is one which will encourage a new attention to undergraduate education. But there is little evidence that political scientists as political scientists are prepared to endorse, let alone to lead, any such change. Political science as a discipline resides in an educational wilderness which it has helped to create, and which it has helped to perpetuate. Political science as a discipline enjoys its anarchy of educational philosophy and of educational psychology. Current knowledge about the body politic is not about to give way to efforts to explore and develop a knowledge about the body academic.

Trustees and Administration

Trustees

Kingman Brewster, Jr., *Chairman*
President, Yale University

Pauline Tompkins, *Vice Chairman*
President, Cedar Crest College

J. Richardson Dilworth
Rockefeller Family and Associates

Cecelia Hodges Drewry
Assistant Dean of the College
Princeton University

Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr.
President, State University of
New York College at Buffalo

Donald N. Frey
Chairman of the Board
Bell & Howell Company

William Friday
President, University of North
Carolina

Robert F. Goheen
Chairman of the Board
Council on Foundations

Hanna H. Gray
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Northwestern University

Theodore M. Hesburgh
President, University of Notre Dame

John G. Kemeny
President, Dartmouth College

Clark Kerr
Chairman and Director, Carnegie
Commission on Higher Education

Herman H. Long
President, Talladega College

Candida Lund
President, Rosary College

Margaret L. A. MacVicar
Assistant Professor
Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

Sterling M. McMurrin
Dean of the Graduate School,
University of Utah

Malcolm C. Moos
President, University of Minnesota

Rosemary Park
Professor, School of Education
University of California

James A. Perkins
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive Officer
International Council for
Educational Development

Alan Pifer
President, The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

Joseph B. Platt
President, Harvey Mudd College

Stephen H. Spurr
President, University of Texas

Sidney J. Weinberg, Jr.
Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
President, Michigan State University

O. Meredith Wilson
Director, Center for Advanced
Study in the Behavioral Sciences

Finance and Administration Committee

Sidney J. Weinberg, Jr., *Chairman*
J. Richardson Dilworth
Donald N. Frey
Robert F. Goheen
James A. Perkins
Alan Pifer

Nominating Committee

Robert F. Goheen, *Chairman*
Hanna H. Gray
Sterling M. McMurrin
Alan Pifer

Administration

New York Office

Alan Pifer, *President*
David Z. Robinson, *Vice President*
Florence Anderson, *Secretary*
F. Lee Jacquette, *Treasurer*
E. Alden Dunham, *Executive Associate*
Clara F. Clapp, *Assistant to the Secretary and Treasurer*

Washington Office

Philip H. Abelson, *Assistant Secretary*

West Coast Office (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education)

Clark Kerr, *Chairman and Executive Director*
Margaret S. Gordon, *Associate Director*
Verne A. Stadtman, *Associate Director and Editor*
Allan Cartter, *Senior Research Fellow*
Florence Eisemann, *Senior Administrative Assistant*